CHALLENGES TO ATATÜRK'S NATIONALISM AND TURANISM

Mustafa Enver

BERSERKER
BOOKS

CHALLENGES TO ATATÜRK'S NATIONALISM AND TURANISM

2nd EDITION

FOREWORD

From the 1940s, but particularly from the 1950s onwards, two versions of Atatürk emerged: one who actually lived, and another about whom writings were produced but who never actually existed. Turanists funded by the United States and historians educated through the Fulbright Programme re-created Atatürk in accordance with American demands and interests. In one instance, we saw an Atatürk who was hostile to communism; in another, one who espoused Turanism. Words were attributed to Atatürk. Leaders, ideologues, writers and politicians who did not serve American interests and whose actions did not suit the collaborators in Turkey were either completely erased from history and forgotten, or discredited by having extreme statements attributed to them—as was done to Mahmut Esat Bozkurt—or declared to be Turanists like Atatürk. So what really happened? Who were the true Turkish nationalists, and who were the 'crypto-Turks' and 'crypto-Turkish nationalists'?

The Atatürk we are told about today is not the same as the Atatürk who founded the Republic. Nor is the Republic now the Republic that Atatürk founded. They have won. Atatürk's enemies have won. In this book, you will read about both the true Atatürk, the founder of our Republic, and the identity of the false nationalists who were enemies of both him and the Turkish nation.

INTRODUCTION

To understand who challenged Atatürk's nationalism, one must first know who the architects of their ideologies were, and the centres from which they took their orders. In the 19th century, it was not the Turks but the Jews who discovered the 'Turks' in Central Asia. It was the Jews who laid the foundations of Turanism through so-called scientific studies and who first put forward the idea of Turanism; those who brought this ideology to Turkey, however, were Russia and the Turkish Freemasons. Consequently, the idea of Turanism is not a Turkish idea; nor has it ever been. Therefore, it would be more accurate to speak of the 'Jewish Turan ideal' rather than the 'Turkish Turan ideal'.

We shall examine the emergence of Turanism, the reasons for the need for such an ideology, the emergence of Turkish nationalism, the relationship between Atatürk and Turkish nationalism, and how the Jews corrupted Turkish nationalism; we shall analyse the individuals and their aims, citing examples and historical dates, and touch upon intriguing coincidences and murky events. Of course, in the process, you will also see how not only Turkish nationalism but also Atatürkism has been corrupted and distorted. Not just in the context of Turkish nationalism, but in every sense.

THE BIRTH OF TURKISH NATIONALISM

The idea of Turkish nationalism emerged as an alternative to ideologies such as Pan-Ottomanism and Islamism, which had been put forward as solutions to the crises experienced during the collapse of the Ottoman Empire but ultimately failed. The emergence of Turkish nationalism and its subsequent division into the 'Anatolianists' and 'Turanists' occurred almost simultaneously. In fact, most of those who diluted Turkish nationalism—which was based on the Turks and Anatolia and formulated by Turks—by incorporating the idea of Turanism were Muslims born in Russia. Those who supported this idea within the Ottoman Empire were the Freemasons.

There are two points we must highlight at this stage. The first is the claim that Arab nationalism emerged as a reaction to Turkish nationalism. Islamists and some liberals hold Turkish nationalism responsible for the emergence of Arab nationalism. Had Turkish historians not provided false, inaccurate or incomplete information regarding Turkish history, this claim could never have been put forward in the first place. So, what did Turkish historians fail to mention?

One point we must highlight—and which our historians have completely overlooked—is that the humiliating and discriminatory practices against Christians in the Ottoman Empire began after Jews were admitted to the Ottoman Court as advisers. Another point we must highlight—and which our historians have again completely ignored—is that the Emirate of Saudi Arabia was founded in 1744 and declared war on the Ottomans. Moreover, the Ottomans were defeated in these wars. However, the historians trained by our state—which became a US satellite after 1950 and whose education policies were determined by the Americans—have never addressed these issues. Let us recount the story from the beginning.

Turkish Nationalism Was a Reaction to Arab Nationalism

There is one subject that nobody mentions when it comes to the Arabs: the Ottoman–Arab Wars. The first Arab state was the Emirate of Diriyah, established as early as 1744 in Riyadh and its surroundings. The Emirate of Diriyah would later take the name Saudi Arabia and has continued to exist to this day.

This emirate, founded in 1744, laid the foundations for what is now Saudi Arabia. In 1802, Saudi forces advanced as far as Karbala, just 100 kilometres from Baghdad, where they set fire to the shrines and plundered the city. In 1805, Saudi forces attacked the Ottomans once more, capturing not only Mecca and Medina but also Taif and the Hejaz. These cities remained under Saudi rule until 1813; it would take the Ottomans a further eight years to reclaim them. It is precisely this that lay at the heart of Arab nationalism, which had become clearly evident in Ottoman territories during the 1800s.

The victories achieved by their brothers—who shared the same ethnicity and spoke the same language—against the Ottomans had a profound impact on the Arabs.

The foundations of Arab nationalism were laid during this period, and subsequently became more visible through publications such as newspapers and magazines.

Like other separatist movements emerging within the Ottoman Empire at the time, Arab nationalists initially demanded reforms, the granting of autonomy, the recognition of Arabic as an official language, the appointment of more Arabs to local administrative posts, and the granting of various political rights to Arabs. Meanwhile, a political party known as the Ottoman Party for Administrative Decentralisation was founded in Cairo. At the Arab Congress they convened in 1913, they articulated these demands, including the establishment of military units composed of Arabs in the region. Another demand regarding military service was that Arab soldiers should not be sent to other, non-Arab regions of the Ottoman Empire. They also issued a declaration stating their support for the Armenians' demands for reform.

The modern Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is the successor to the Emirate of Diriyah. The map above shows the greatest extent of the Emirate of Diriyah's borders prior to the founding of Saudi Arabia.

The Founder of Turkish Nationalism: Mustafa Celalettin Pasha

Turkish nationalism also developed in parallel with the emerging nationalist movements around the world and during the period of imperial decline. It was Mustafa Celalettin Pasha who first put forward the idea of 'Turkishness'. The first study conducted in the Ottoman Empire on the racial characteristics, history and culture of the Turks was his work. He attracted attention by linking 'Turkishness' with race; by asserting that the Turks belonged to the 'White race'; and by the importance he attached to race.

Mustafa Celalettin Pasha's book *The Ancient and Modern Turks*, written in 1869 and examining the racial characteristics, history, culture and language of the Turks, was influential in fostering a sense of Turkish identity and pride amongst Ottoman intellectuals. However, the Islamist perspective that prevailed amongst most Ottoman intellectuals of the time led to the widespread rejection of Celalettin Pasha's views on race and the reforms he proposed for the salvation of the Ottoman Empire. It was not until the era of Atatürk and after the proclamation of the Republic that Celalettin Pasha's views on race would gain widespread acceptance within Turkish nationalist circles.

Mustafa Celalettin Pasha's work on the Turkish race also influenced the leading poets and writers of the time. The sense of Turkish identity and pride he fostered played a significant role in reminding people that the Ottoman Empire was, in fact, a Turkish state. The Kurdish and Arab uprisings that began in the 19th century led some Turks to abandon Ottomanist and Islamist views. The Turks increasingly came to embrace the idea that the fate of the country they had founded should lie solely in their own hands.

In this work, Mustafa Celalettin Pasha did not merely address the characteristics of the Turkish race and Turkish history; he also put forward solutions to prevent the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. He told the Balkan nations that "Turks are of the same race as themselves, that is, the White race, and that it was wrong and pointless for them to fight against the Turks, who were in fact their racial kin." To the Turks, he recommended that they "abandon the Christian-Muslim distinction and grant the Christian Balkan peoples the same rights they accorded to Muslim peoples." In fact, Celalettin Pasha's proposals were nothing other than a call for the Ottoman Empire to return to its founding principles. A major factor in the Byzantine and Balkan peoples' acceptance of Ottoman rule was the Ottomans' practice of not distinguishing between their Christian subjects and Muslim Turks. Consequently, for these peoples, only the ruling monarch changed; their rights remained the same. Moreover, this Ottoman practice had been in place since the time of the Seljuks. However, from the 1500s onwards, this situation changed with the arrival of Jews in the Ottoman Empire and their appointment to influential positions at the Palace. The Ottomans placed a trust in these Jews—who were not even Ottoman citizens and who had constantly changed the kings and countries they served—that they did not extend to their Muslim or Christian subjects. We shall return to this subject later.

Of course, there were many other proposals in this work. But, unfortunately, both the Islamist-minded Ottoman intellectuals and Masonic circles opposed these proposals. The outcome is well known to us all. Today, whilst figures such as the Unionists—who dragged the Ottoman Empire into war in the name of Turanism—and Ziya Gökalp, of Kurdish origin, who introduced Turanism into the programme of the Committee of Union and Progress, are remembered, it is regrettable that no mention is made of Mustafa Celalettin Pasha, the founder of Turkish nationalism, or of his contributions to Turkism. Having joined the army in 1852 after passing the officer's examination, Celalettin Pasha took part in countless skirmishes and wars within the Turkish army and was wounded on numerous occasions. He was killed in action during the 1875 Ottoman–Montenegro War, the last conflict in which he served.

In the late 1800s, Turkish nationalists were working to retain control of the Balkans and the Middle East, whilst ensuring that the administration remained in Turkish hands. After the Balkans were lost, and it became clear that the Arabs would also secede, they turned their attention to protecting and Turkifying Anatolia, the last remaining piece of their homeland. The Turks had lived in Anatolia continuously for 1,000 years. The Ottoman Empire had been founded on these lands. The most significant aspects of Turkish culture and history had taken shape here. There existed a Turkish nation that shared not only cultural but also racial characteristics. The homeland was Anatolia; the Turk was the people of Anatolia and their extensions in the Balkans.

In the Ottoman worldview, there was no place for the concepts of 'race' or 'nation'. The term 'Turk' was an adjective used primarily for the peasants living in Anatolia and the Turkish tribes, and was often accompanied by derogatory words such as 'crude',

'ignorant'. So much so that in Ottoman history books, the Turks were referred to in derogatory terms such as 'Etrak-ı bî-idrak' and 'Ekrad-ı bed-nihad'. For example, the renowned historian Naima, who was himself a Turk, spoke of the Turks as 'unthinking' (Mumcu A., 1980:78).

The studies on Turkish history and language, which began with the work of Mustafa Celattin Pasha, played a significant role in sparking an interest in Anatolia amongst Ottoman intellectuals. The famine and mass migration resulting from the drought and harsh winter experienced in Anatolia in 1872 ensured that, for the first time, the problems of the Turkish nation truly resonated in the capital. The blood ties and racial kinship binding the Turks were recalled and, albeit indirectly, given voice: The Basiret newspaper, published in Istanbul, organised a relief campaign and featured the following statements on its pages: "O all the children of the fatherland, let us think carefully! If we fail even in the slightest to assist the people of Anatolia and meet their needs, we shall have broken our own right arm. Most of our soldiers, most of our compatriots, are our brothers who grew up in Anatolia. Most of the needs that must be met arise thanks to their generosity and hard work. Whilst these children of the homeland are serving in our most sacred cause, if we fail to come to their aid on such a dark day, when will we ever do so? Let us consider the aid you will provide, the bravery you will display, and the effort you will make. The aid you give them is aid given to yourselves. This aid we give to ourselves will, in the end, serve as support for us once more."

By the late 1800s, the idea of Turkish nationalism had begun to gain acceptance amongst Ottoman intellectuals. However, the Turkish nationalists had no notion of 'Turan'. They were aware of the historical, linguistic and cultural differences between the Turks and the disputed Turkic peoples of Asia. And although they did not perceive the reality of race in the same way as Mustafa Celalettin Pasha, they were also aware that the Turks did not originate from the same race as the Asians, who were, in fact, only partially Turkified. For this reason, figures such as Celal Nuri argued that the race in Anatolia was distinct and unique. Although he did not base his arguments on skin colour, skull structure and so on, and although he did not make clear-cut definitions, the conclusion he actually reached was the same as that of Celalettin Pasha: the ordinary Turk on the street had fair, light brown or sometimes wheat-coloured skin. The number of those with blond hair and coloured eyes was also by no means small. It was precisely at this stage in the development of Turkism that the course of history was altered by the emergence of Masonic Turkists, who were financially supported by Russia and fuelled by the fabricated theories of historians such as Vambery, Herzl's right-hand man. After seizing control of the Ottoman state, the Turanists relinquished thousands of square kilometres of territory inhabited by a significant Turkish population, all in the name of waging war against Russia and marching towards Turan. And in 1913, they handed these lands over to Bulgaria without firing a single shot.

The emergence of Turkish nationalism and its advocacy as an alternative to the Ottomanist perspective, as well as the first newspaper to ground Turkish nationalism in Anatolia and the Turkish race, was the *Anadolu* newspaper, which began publication in 1902 under the editorship of Süleyman Vahid. In 1906, a group of Ottoman intellectuals led by Dr Abdullah Cevdet Bey argued for the need to change the 'Ottoman' overarching identity. The Ottomans were, in fact, Turks; those who governed the state were Turks; and Anatolia was the homeland of the Turks. Consequently, the concepts of 'Turk' and 'Turkish' were proposed as alternatives to the 'Ottoman' overarching identity; more importantly, it was emphasised that these were not distinct from one another.

The emergence of Turkish nationalism and its advocacy as an alternative to the Ottomanist perspective, and the first newspaper to ground Turkish nationalism in Anatolia and the Turkish lineage, was the *Anadolu* newspaper, which began publication in 1902 by Süleyman Vahid. In 1906, a group of Ottoman intellectuals led by Dr Abdullah Cevdet Bey argued for the necessity of changing the overarching identity of 'Ottoman'. The Ottomans were, in fact, Turks; those governing the state were Turks; and Anatolia was the homeland of the Turks. For this reason, the concepts of 'Turk' and 'Turkish citizen' were proposed in place of the 'Ottoman' overarching identity; more importantly, it was emphasised that these were not distinct from one another.

In fact, during the early days of the Ottoman Empire, Christians and Muslims enjoyed the same rights. By 'Muslims', we mean Turks, as the Kurdish and Arab populations had not yet become part of the empire. However, in the early 1500s, Jews who entered the Ottoman court first shifted the Turks' focus from Europe to the Middle East, and subsequently had the Christians—whom they despised—removed from Ottoman administration. Powers not granted to Christians were bestowed upon the Jews. Moreover, whilst there were millions of loyal Christian Ottoman citizens, the highest positions were awarded to Jews who were not even Ottoman citizens. Up until Josep Nasi, the Jews acted as advisers to the sultans under the guise of 'the sultan's physician or chief physician', shaping the Ottoman Empire's domestic and international relations; from Nasi onwards, these roles were formalised and they were appointed as members of the Divan. They began to participate in the Divan as the sultan's representative within the council, that is, in the capacity of 'court commissioner'. Thus, from the 1500s onwards, the Ottoman Empire broke with a tradition that had persisted since the Seljuk period. The expulsion of Christians from state administration not only halted the Turks' advance into Europe but also disrupted the internal peace of the state, thereby laying the foundations for the uprisings that would follow.

The Ottoman Empire's shift towards an Islamist and sectarian line, the occurrence of massacres of Turks, and the rise of Jewish influence within the Ottoman Empire all coincided with the same period —namely, the reign of Yavuz Sultan. It was Yavuz who brought the Kurds to Anatolia. The entrusting of the Ottoman treasury, right down to the provincial level, to Jewish treasurers also took place during the reign of this great Islamic sultan. In essence, therefore, Celalettin Pasha's proposal was a revival of the old order. However, due to the understanding of Islam and Islamism that the Jews had introduced into the Ottoman Empire—which had left the empire lagging behind—there was no one in the Ottoman Empire who could appreciate the value of these views.

For this reason, no one heeded his proposals until the time of Atatürk. By the time Atatürk came to power, it was, unfortunately, far too late to implement all of Celalettin Pasha's proposals. For this reason, Atatürk was compelled to opt for population exchange with regard to the Christians.

When the Turkish Associations were first established, they were not Turanist. The rise of this movement within the Turkish Associations coincided with Ziya Gökalp's inclusion of Turanism in the programme of the Committee of Union and Progress and the Ottoman Empire's entry into the war. Otherwise, up until that time, Turanism had been nothing more than the voice of a vocal minority. Meanwhile, Arminius Vambery, a Jewish Turkologist and Herzl's personal spy, was also constantly sending articles to the Turanists within the Turkish Cultural Associations to offer his support. It was not until 1915 that Turanism began to move beyond being the ideology of adventurous Committee of Union and Progress members and started to find a social base. The first reactions against Turanism also came from within the Turkish Cultural Associations. The growing number of Turanists within the Turkish Cultural Associations began to cause unease amongst Turkish nationalists. Necip Türkçü, Chairman of the Izmir Turkish Cultural Association stated in a lecture he gave at the Izmir Turkish Association in 1915 that one could not be Turkish outside of Anatolia and Rumelia, and that, in the face of the geographical reality defined as the homeland, Turanism could not constitute a homeland in either an emotional or intellectual sense. Over time, tensions between Turkish nationalists and Turanists escalated. At the General Congress of 1917, the two sides came face to face. From this point onwards, control of the Turkish Cultural Associations would pass to the Turanists, who had by then become well-established thanks to German and Jewish support.

Whilst some made ideological contributions to Turkish nationalism, others contributed in cultural and literary terms. The concept of 'Turkishness' and 'Turkish nationalism' was based on a vision of Turkism centred on Anatolia and the Turkish nation. Hilmi Ziya Ülken, together with Reşit Kayı, published the journal *Anadolu* between 1918 and 1919. Hilmi Ziya notes that the discourse of 'patriotism' diverged into into "Cultural Anatolianism" and "Ideological Anatolianism". At the core of this thought, "Ideological Anatolianism"—which adopted the slogan "Turkey belongs to the Turks"—evolved into a philosophy seeking to guide the nation politically and philosophically. (Ülken, 2001, pp. 477–478). The *Anadolu Mecmuası*, published in Istanbul in 1924–1925 by Mehmet Halit Bayır and Haydar Neci, is an important publication that contributed to the intellectual and literary examination of the Turkish Nationalist movement. Among the figures who made significant contributions to Turkish Nationalism were writers such as Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Ziyaeddin Fahri Fındıkoğlu, Necmeddin Halil

Onan, alongside writers and poets such as Necip Fazıl (Kısakürek), Ahmet Hamdi (Tanpınar) and Faruk Nafiz Çamlıbel.

This school of thought, which became even more systematic at the Mekteb-i Mülkiye, was characterised as 'Anatolianism' by so-called Turkish nationalists and so-called Turkists. Indeed, it was presented as if it had no connection whatsoever to Turkish nationalism. Yet Atatürk's understanding of nationalism was also rooted in the Turks and Anatolia; and Atatürk categorically rejected Turanism. It is no coincidence that, as Atatürk also stated in his Nutuk in 1927, he referred to Turanism as "an impossible goal without precedent in history". Indeed, with the affiliation of the Turkish Associations to the Republican People's Party in 1927, Turanist activities were brought to an end.

We are told the myth that Atatürk was influenced by Ziya Gökalp's ideas, yet this is not true. Gökalp was an ideologue of the Committee of Union and Progress and a member of its 'central committee'. It was he who incorporated Pan-Turkism into the programme of the Committee of Union and Progress. Another lie fabricated by certain sources is the claim that it was Zeki Velidi Togan who introduced ideas concerning the Turkish race to Atatürk. In reality, Togan was forced to flee Turkey and was unable to return until after Atatürk's death. As for the former Turanists who stood by Atatürk, they too were only able to find a place at his side after they had repented.

The Redesign of Turkish Nationalism

Turkish nationalists published the era's first nationalist journals, such as Millet (1942), Hareket (1940), Çığır (1933) and Dönüm (1932). From May 1942 onwards, Remzi Oğuz Arık published the Millet journal together with Hüseyin Avni Göktürk. Nurettin Topçu's *Hareket* and *Millet* magazines were the

(Turkish nationalism). Oğuz Arık founded the 'Turkey Peasants' Party'—Turkey's 'first nationalist party'—in 1952. Remzi Oğuz Arık died in 1952 when the aeroplane he was travelling in exploded in mid-air. In other words, he fell victim to an assassination. This incident became the first link in a chain of assassinations and mysterious deaths, many of which would occur in Turkey subsequently. From this point onwards, Turanism would gradually take the place of Turkish nationalism. The task of dismantling Atatürk's brand of nationalism and redesigning Turkish nationalism was entrusted to Alparslan Türkeş, an officer who had graduated from the United States Military Academy and had also been trained in psychological warfare and counter-guerrilla operations.

In the early period, those who identified as nationalists were categorised into two groups. Among those who identified as Turkish nationalists, those who equated Turkishness with Anatolian Turkishness were called 'Anatolianists', whilst those who equated it with Central Asia and sought to establish a Turan union were called 'Turanists'. However, from the late 1970s onwards, as the Turanist -ideological movement, the process of rewriting the history of Turkish nationalism began; 'Anatolianism' came to be characterised not as a faction within the Turkist movement, but as a distinct and romantic perspective in its own right. The history of the Turanist movement, meanwhile, was presented as if it were the history of Turkish nationalism itself. Even Atatürk, who had fought against Turanism throughout his time in power, closed down the Turkish Cultural Associations solely because of Turanist activities, and forced prominent Turanists who opposed Turkish nationalism to flee abroad, was labelled a Turanist.

Turkish nationalists were defined as 'Anatolians' in opposition to the Turanists. Whilst the truly devout Turkish nationalists—that is, the Anatolians, such as Nurettin Topçu—were accused of reactionaryism and marginalised, those engaged in research into the history of Anatolia were also criticised and accused of admiration for Greece and anti-nationalism.

Nurettin Topçu, one of the most important ideologues and thinkers of Turkish nationalism following Mustafa Celalettin Pasha, was, in every sense, a National Socialist. He was inspired by German National Socialism and proposed seriously statist economic policies for Turkey. Whilst speaking like a proponent of Sharia law on the one hand, he criticised traditionalism on the other. Sufi orders and Islamists were just as much the focus of his criticism as the Turanists. In fact, in his view, the necessary secularisation—or, more accurately, modernisation—should have been achieved over time. Development and modernisation should have come from the grassroots through the education of the people, rather than being state-directed. An Islamic reform could only be realised in this way. He envisaged a society where religion and modernity coexisted, much like in Europe. Otherwise, everything would have remained as it was.

But what had happened had happened. For this reason, whilst Topçu criticised past policies, he did not put forward any new proposals, nor did he ever advocate a regime based on religion. If things had been done as Nurettin Topçu suggested – for example, if people had been properly educated and the history of Islam had been accurately taught…

...would Muslim Turks, having learnt that images and sculptures were not prohibited in Islam until the Abbasid period, have created a different kind of Turkey? And what impact would this have had on the wider Islamic world?

At this point, it should be noted that Topçu was marginalised even by Islamist circles for reasons such as his refusal to be a Sharia advocate; on the contrary, he was a nationalist and socialist reformer of Islam. Ultimately, whether religious or secular, the common ground shared by the Anatolianists—that is, the true Turkish nationalists—was their assertion that the arrival of the Turks in Anatolia marked the beginning of a new era in Turkish history.

Anatolianism was a reaction against Turanism's claims of a so-called common race and/or so-called common ethnic ties, a so-called common culture, and its 'borderless, so-called Turkic ideologies'. Furthermore, the definition of 'nation' held by the group known as the Anatolianists was not, as some have claimed, based solely on geography or culture. Unlike the Turanists, the Anatolianists' definition of Turkishness was genuinely based on Turkish ancestry. What set them apart from the Turanists was that they truly understood what the concepts of race and ethnicity entailed, and used these concepts correctly. For example, Nurettin Topçu expressed the connection between Turkishness and race in the following words: "I do not consider someone to be one of my own if the shape of their face or head does not resemble mine, or if their eyes do not look like mine." "

In another issue of the magazine Hareket, published after the proclamation of the Republic, the following statements appear: "Imagine a hard-working, honourable, fair-skinned person accompanied by a dark-faced, hooked-nosed, dark and gaunt individual? What happens if the child of a noble race mixes with the children of characterless, primitive tribes?" (1937)

For some reason, this statement was altered in the book *The Principles of Our Nationalism*, which was first published years after Topçu's death. What is interesting is that this book has never been reprinted. The fact that the phrase 'dark and gaunt' in the original text has been replaced with 'green-eyed' here indicates that the publisher was endeavouring to distance the author from National Socialist ideology. This is similar to the situation where, years after Atatürk's death, books were published containing fabricated statements claiming that Atatürk was supposedly a Turanist. Perhaps the aim was to erase the traces of racist policies in Turkey. After all, even Afet İnan could not stand by her work and was forced to fabricate excuses for her racial studies. Otherwise, the fact that Afet İnan "did not regard Blacks, Mongoloids and other coloured races as fully human" The following statements appear in the paper she presented at the First Turkish History Congress:

" If one considers the manifestation and development of life in the flora and fauna of various geographical regions and climates, and if one considers that man is nothing more than a natural creature, it is futile to insist on the claim that all humans originate from a single source. A number of human-like creatures have emerged in many parts of the world and have also ; however, those truly worthy of being called 'human' are, in particular, those whose minds—both internally and externally —have been formed and developed in a manner vastly different from all their fellow creatures. (…) Indeed, there has been but a single cradle of high civilisation for humanity: Central Asia" (A. İnan, 1932:22–23)

Incidentally, let us note that, at least at that time, Central Asia was considered to be the homeland of the entire white race and the place where the white race first emerged.

It should be noted, however, that at least at that time, Central Asia was considered to be the homeland of the entire White race and the place where it first emerged.

In other words, Afet İnan is clearly espousing White/Aryan racism. Turkish anthropologists and scientists assert that the Turks have remained racially unadulterated throughout history and belong to the White race. Atatürk also supported these scientists and their views. So much so that he defended these views to the extent of having a 'race studies' course introduced into secondary school textbooks in 1931. The race studies course was subsequently removed in 1941 following demands and pressure from the Turanists; because the Turkic peoples are not of the White race! And protecting the Turkish race is not the mission of the Turanists. Their mission is to please their masters abroad, whether they be Zionists or Christians. This was the case in the past, and it remains so today.

For some time after Atatürk's death, articles 'taking racial reality into account' continued to be published. Let us, for example, look at an article translated by Prof. Dr Seniha Tunahan, one of Turkey's first female anthropologists:

"All people belonging to different races exhibit many similarities and commonalities. We have no doubt about this. However, despite all these similarities and commonalities specific to the human species, there are still significant differences amongst people. They are divided into a number of races that are partly close to one another and partly very distant. The issue here is to understand why this is so, and how this division came about.

There are two paths before us to resolve this issue: the first is the history of race. Here, our evidence regarding the history of a race consists of skeletal remains from past eras. The second is 'genetic research'. Our knowledge of the laws of inheritance, changes occurring in genes—that is, mutations—inheritance patterns, variations, and natural selection helps us to elucidate how races and racial differences arose.

We know that the term 'race' refers to human populations possessing certain hereditary characteristics. Each group possesses such traits that, on their own, are sufficient to distinguish one group from another. Thus, the emergence of races signifies the emergence of specific traits. These, however, are not limited to just one or two characteristics. The issue is not merely one of height, head width and length, or differences in colour. Rather, these are anatomical, physiological, normal or pathological, and ultimately psychological characteristics which serve to definitively distinguish one group from another."

We would like to draw your attention to the phrase 'psychological characteristics' here. What is at issue is not merely the characters of certain races. Cognitive abilities are also at stake. In other words, intelligence and the capacity to create civilisation are also at stake.

Let us return to where we left off. In 1908, with the publication of the Anadolu newspaper by Mehmed Burhaneddin, and in 1911 by Haydar Rüşdü, the idea of Turkish nationalism also began to gradually take shape. In 1911, the Vazife Mecmuası, which featured articles by Nüzhet Sabit, argued that 'nationalism cannot take on a genuine character whilst remaining confined to an undefined and imaginary geography; and that this could divert it from its fundamental mission of realising the true ideal of nationalism', thus maintaining that 'Turkish nationalism must take shape centred on the geography of Anatolia'. Nationalism must be built upon Turkishness and Anatolia.

Published in 1913, the *İslam Mecmuası*, which featured articles by Musa Kazım, Mehmed Şemseddin (Günaltay) and Halim Sabit (Sibay), was a journal in which the ideas of Turkish nationalism and Anatolianism were examined in the context of opposition to Turanism. As early as 1918, Celal Nuri İleri, in his articles in the İleri newspaper, drew attention to the relationship between land and nation within the context of race, time and geography. He argued that the Turks had preserved their racial characteristics and had evolved into a distinct nation separate from the Turkic peoples of Central Asia. In other words, the peoples of Central Asia had become racially 'corrupted' through intermingling with the Mongols and other Mongoloid peoples. The only ones to have preserved their racial purity were the Turks who had come to Anatolia. In other words, the 'true' Turks were in Anatolia. The others, however, had lost their Turkish identity through intermarriage. This line of thought was refined and developed into a systematic ideology in periodicals such as the *Dergâh* magazine, where Yahya Kemal was influential in 1921; *Anadolu Mecmuası*, edited by Mehmed Halid in 1924; and *Anadolu Duygusu*, published by İbrahim Turgut in Ankara in 1922. *Anadolu Mecmuası* served as a primary source in the spread of Turkish nationalism. In his articles, written in five parts under the title 'The Conquest of Anatolia', Mükrimin Halil recounted the conquest of Anatolia and the settlement movement of the Turks there, which began with the Turkish tribes.

"Those who conquered Anatolia and settled there, arriving as nomads to establish towns and villages, were tribes belonging to the Turkish nation. In short, the people of Anatolia are Oghuz, or, to put it another way, Turks." By referring to the conquest of Anatolia by Sultan Alparslan in 1071, the Battle of Malazgirt, and the distribution of the conquered lands among the beys who took part in the battle —leading to the settlement of Turks in those regions—he clarifies why 1071 is considered the historical starting point of the Turkish nationalist movement. The journal also features various articles on the division of the Turkish people into different tribes, the formation of a Turkish homeland in Anatolia, and the establishment of the Turks as a distinct nation there. In fact, this subject has been raised on various occasions by many Turkish nationalists, including Nurettin Topçu, and numerous articles on the matter have subsequently been published in various journals and newspapers. Furthermore, a large number of books on this subject have been published by some of the authors mentioned above.

For Turkish nationalists, the year 1071—marking the arrival of the Turks in Anatolia—represented a significant turning point. Yahya Kemal contributed to this idea by stating that the Anatolian soil had forged the Turkish nation following the year 1071. Nurettin Topçu, too, viewed the phenomenon of nation-building in Anatolia as 'a necessity created by the interplay of land and economy', and criticised Islamist and Turanist movements that did not take Anatolian soil as their foundation, stating: 'This nation's people were created by this land.' He accused the Turanists of 'lumping together Turks who had not formed a nation with Turks who had not formed a nation, and thereby counting them as Turks as well'. 'This nation has been created by this land. The son of this country, oblivious to this truth, has grown weary and deluded from chasing after loves severed from body and heart—such as Islamism, which is at times detached from lineage and homeland, and Turanism, which flees from the soil of the homeland—and each has, in its own era, deceived the nation's destiny.'

Nurettin Topçu is the figure who put forward the Mystic/Islamic Anatolianism perspective, thereby transforming the concept of Anatolianism and guiding it with his own conceptual framework. According to Topçu, "Islam, whilst being the essential element of identity, has also been a fundamental factor in the formation of the homeland and the emergence of the nation. The Turks' formation as a nation took place alongside Islam (Topçu, 1972, p. 38). Like Cevat Şakir, Nurettin Topçu acknowledges the pre-Islamic civilisation of Anatolia. Topçu does not hesitate to emphasise the contributions made by ancient civilisations, stating: 'In truth, we must seek the roots of Anatolia —which Islam has perpetuated and bequeathed to us—as well as the earliest foundations and beginnings of our national history, in pre-Islamic Anatolia.' On the other hand, by excluding those who do not share "the shape of their face and the structure of their body, which resemble mine" or "physical resemblances such as the shape of their head, the form of their face, and the meaning in their eyes" from the unity he calls the 'nation', he demonstrates the importance he attaches to race.

Topçu's worldview rests on two main axes: "on the one hand, a reckoning with the West; on the other, a stance against Turanism and Islamism as part of the East's internal reckoning." In Nurettin Topçu's intellectual world, the influence of German National Socialism and the racial views of National Socialism can also be seen. He advocates a form of socialism which he defines as 'Anatolian Socialism'.

Although Turkish nationalism branches out into different strands, poets and writers generally centre their focus on Anatolia, viewing it as the true source and taking the Anatolian land—within the context of homeland and nation—as a unifying foundation in geographical, historical and cultural terms; they strive to reach a broad audience through both essays on philosophy and through short stories, novels and poetry.

Another significant figure is Cevat Şakir Kabaağaçlı. He developed an approach that embraces all peoples who have lived within the geography of Anatolia, along with their respective values, and places the issue of civilisation at its core.

'Anatolia is a cradle of civilisations, and the Turks must accept these values—regardless of who produced them—without distinction as to religion, language or culture.' (Halıkarnas Balıkçısı, 1954, p. 11)

Another key figure who regarded Anatolia as the true home of Turkish nationalism, argued that nationalism had taken shape and emerged here—a development stemming from Anatolia's unique conditions and potential—and defended the Anatolian movement against both nationalism and who championed the Anatolian movement in opposition to Turanism, is Remzi Oğuz Arık. This perspective, which approaches nationalism within the context of land and history, advocates for a form of nationalism born of Anatolia's specific conditions (Arık, 1956, p. 3).

It is regrettable, though by no means surprising, that these ideologues, writers, politicians and thinkers—who contributed to the development of Turkish nationalism—have been consigned to oblivion and are never referenced by so-called nationalists. Mustafa Celalettin Pasha, Nurettin Topçu, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Nüzhet Sabit, Mehmet Kaplan, Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Abdullah Cevdet, Remzi Oğuz Arık, Nurettin Topçu, Yahya Kemal Beyatlı, Nüzhet Sabit, Mehmet Kaplan, Mükrimin Halil Yinanç, Hilmi Ziya Ülken, Remzi Oğuz Arık and Abdullah Cevdet are figures who played a significant role in the development and spread of Turkish nationalism. Unfortunately, however, the true founders of Turkish nationalism have been completely overlooked by the so-called 'Turkic nationalists' and have been deliberately consigned to oblivion.

The Racial Characteristics of the Turks

The findings of anthropological studies conducted on the Turks during this period—particularly those carried out by foreign researchers—are also of interest. Pittard, who was Prof. Dr Afet İnan's mentor and the honorary president of the Turkish Institute of Anthropology, reached the following conclusions as a result of his studies on the Turkish people: 'The Turks are one of the most handsome races in Eurasia. In the Balkan Peninsula, where one may encounter many striking human types, the Turks are far from being overshadowed. Having seen many Turks, I can say that they cannot share a common origin with the Mongols. Those exhibiting Mongoloid features in Anatolia are so few as to be negligible, and are likely communities left over from the Mongol invasions. Furthermore, hazel and blue eyes are more common among the Ottoman Turks than is generally believed. I can say the same about blondes. There are also quite a few with light-coloured hair. Incidentally, I should also point out that I found no blue eyes whatsoever amongst the Kurds; amongst the Laz and Armenians, they are rare."

The French anthropologist Ernest Chantre also had the following to say regarding the racial characteristics of the Turks: "Among the men I studied in Anatolia, light-coloured eyes accounted for 20 per cent, whilst blond hair accounted for 38 per cent." At this point, it should be noted that some anthropologists classify light-coloured or honey-coloured hair as 'blond'. In other words, do not expect to see large numbers of people with hair as light as a Swedish blonde's just by looking at people on the street. In subsequent studies, the proportion of Turks who are true blondes has been clearly specified, and the proportion of blond Turks has been stated as 14 per cent.

When those with hair colours such as honey blonde—which some consider a type of blonde—are included, it is seen that this proportion has remained largely unchanged for a long time.

Indeed, the prevalence of light eye colour in Anatolia has been emphasised in the studies of both Afet İnan and the Turkish Institute of Anthropology. In her 1939 publication, "The Anthropological Character of the Turkish People

An Anthropological Survey of 64,000 People: "Among the people living in Anatolia, skin is rarely dark/very swarthy (referring to Kurds). In the words of Prof. Afet İnan, 'Among Turks, skin colour is generally white.' Eye colour is light. The proportion of Turks with coloured eyes is close to 20 per cent. The majority of hair is also a medium chestnut colour."

Aside from this, numerous local and foreign historians and anthropologists also state that the Turks are, in fact, a race with light-coloured hair and coloured eyes. Indeed, Osman Karatay notes that having 'black hair' was perceived as a curse amongst the ancient Turks. The 'Lolan Beauty', described as the 'grandmother of the Turks' and found mummified in the Agricultural Basin of China, also had red hair and blue eyes. Şevket Aziz Kansu, a leading figure in Turkish anthropology, stated that the Turks "have no connection with the 'yellow races', which are essentially far removed from being a distinct race"; he went on to note that, based on studies of the people of Anatolia, the region was "settled by a race that was 'white or wheat-coloured-skinned, beautiful, sometimes blue-eyed and with auburn hair'."

Incidentally, let us note that black hair alone is not a racial criterion. A fair-skinned person may also have black hair. This does not mean they are not of the white race, or of Turkish descent. But if their skin is dark, and you have started to wonder whether they are Arab, Afghan, Kurdish, etc., there is no need to elaborate. That person is not Turkish. The fact that this person speaks Turkish without an accent does not change anything. That person is not Turkish. In Turkey, only Kurds have dark skin, and they are the only ones who could be mistaken for Arabs.

There is one further point we wish to raise regarding the racial characteristics of Turks. Interestingly, a survey conducted in the 1980s indicated that the proportions of fair-skinned and wheat-skinned Turks were roughly equal. According to this survey, whilst Turks are generally fair-skinned, there are also a significant number of wheat-skinned individuals. In fact, they account for nearly half the population. This survey was not as comprehensive as those carried out during Atatürk's time and was conducted using crude observational methods rather than precise measurements. As it was carried out after the 12 September Coup—a period in which 'Atatürkism' had been stripped of its key elements such as nationalism, race and statism, and reduced to a hollow shell under the guise of 'Atatürkism', creating a version of Atatürk that was truly disconnected from reality—the purpose behind its conduct is open to debate. However, as we currently have no opportunity to carry out proper research on this matter, we deem it appropriate to refrain from making further comments. All we can say is that there are certain differences between the results of this survey, carried out in the 1980s, and the results of the racial study conducted using the most scientific methods and the largest sample size in Turkish history.

The Concept of Turkish Nationalism During the Atatürk Era

Until around the late 1960s, the view held by Turkish nationalists, including Atatürk, was as follows: 'The Turks are a people of the White race who settled in the Balkans and Anatolia. The Laz, Circassians and so on are other ethnic groups belonging to the White race. However, Anatolia is the Turkish homeland; and the Turkish nation emerged as a result of all ethnic groups—the Laz, Circassians, Bosniaks and so on—coming together and assimilating within the geography of Anatolia. Yet the dominant element is the Turk. The Ottomans were founded by the Turks, and Anatolia is the Turkish homeland. All these ethnic groups must be boiled and melted down in the crucible of Turkishness. The Turks are the heirs of the Ottoman Empire, which was itself the successor to the Byzantine Empire; the Byzantine Empire was the successor to ancient Greece; and ancient Greece was the successor to the ancient civilisations of Anatolia. "For this reason, all of these are part of our culture."

This is also the reason behind Atatürk's choice of the 'Hittite Sun' as the symbol of Ankara. It is certainly not to portray the Turks as the indigenous people of Anatolia in opposition to the West. What just cause could you possibly explain to people who set out from England and France to occupy half the world? Moreover, Atatürk was not someone who, like today's spineless figures, sought Western approval for every policy he pursued.

A paper presented at one of the CHP Conferences held in 1932: "It is Kemalism that has defined the bond of unity in accordance with truth and science. In Ziya Gökalp's conception of nationalism, unity of origin (ancestry, race) is not at issue; 'everything of foreign origin is Turkish.' Whereas

according to Kemalist Turkism, only those of Turkish descent are Turkish." (CHP Conference Series, 1932, Volume 19, Alpine Race, the Turkish Ethnic Group and the People of Hatay)

As we know, Ziya Gökalp is one of the ideological forefathers of Turanism, and these ideas are the reason he considered the Turks (the peoples of Central Asia) to be linguistically and culturally close to the Turks—a closeness that is, in fact, imaginary. Yet, as we have seen above, this is not sufficient for Atatürk. A direct and personal blood tie is required.

Let us now examine the term 'of Turkish origin' used in the Conference in a little more detail, again drawing on the official communiqués of the time.

"Today's Turkish civilisation belongs to the White Alpine Race, which arrived in the West in prehistoric times, and represents a human type possessing a biologically perfect skeleton, physique and mind, well-suited to material and spiritual development." (Proceedings of the 1st Turkish History Congress, 1932)

"In the formation of a nation, 'blood' is just as important an element as language and culture… In Kemalism, the people are united not only by blood but also by a unity of will." (Constitutional Law of the Republic of Turkey: Lectures Delivered at the Higher Police Institute, Vasfi Raşit Sevig, 1938)

Furthermore, at the 2nd Turkish History Congress, it was stated that Turkish nationalism was closely linked to the racial ties of the Turks, and the importance of the racial element for national identity was emphasised once again. (Proceedings of the 2nd Turkish History Congress, 1937)

Again, as seen in the example of Afet İnan mentioned above, we have witnessed how the purpose of the studies conducted during Atatürk's era was subsequently distorted. In her work, İnan went so far as to explicitly refer to "human-like creatures in various parts of the world". It is clear that this had nothing to do with defending the Turks against the West. Just like the "racial studies" courses imposed on the Turkish people.

Then there are the peculiar theories put forward by the Pan-Turkist camp. "Turks may exhibit different racial characteristics depending on the regions they inhabit." Let us respond to this with the words spoken by Dr Reşit Galib, a medical doctor, at the 1st Turkish History Congress.

"The features of our race, height, beauty or ugliness has not failed to occupy European authors to some extent. I mentioned in the earlier sections that the latest and definitive anthropological studies have established that we are the descendants of the brachycephalic Alpine peoples, the forefathers of our civilisations. It would also be entertaining to pause for a moment on the traditional errors of European scholarship in this regard. (…) They said, and a few living exponents of this tradition still maintain that the Turks belong to the yellow race, are Mongoloid, and part of the Mongol community. Let us first of all declare that we regard with derision (scorn/contempt) and derision (humiliation), and we accuse them of being far behind—and still lagging—in understanding our concept of humanity, whilst carrying the bigotry of the Middle Ages upon the export customs cranes and bales of textiles that represent their true spirits! (Applause) (…)" "(…) Esteemed and distinguished lecturers of our University, our teacher-training colleges, our grammar schools and our secondary schools: The truth is established in your eyes and in ours. Those who carry the blood of Turkishness, whose essence is inexhaustible in every noble sense, can have no doubt of this. Our cause is to place our truth amongst the beliefs of all humanity. The flashes of knowledge and guidance from you, and from the international authorities on Turkish history whom you will train, will shatter and disperse the clouds of bigotry—both domestic and foreign—that have been pouring tar upon Turkish history for centuries, and will bring Turkish history out of Ergenekon. This will be not merely a victory for our history, but for the eternal 'truth'. (Loud and sustained applause)"

That aside, ask yourselves the following questions. Since races are influenced by climate and geography, why are the Canadian Indigenous peoples and the Inuit not fair-haired, even though the climate of Canada and Northern Europe is the same? Why, in American states with a climate similar to that of Western Europe, or in regions of China with the same climatic characteristics, do the Native Americans or Asians not resemble the French or the Germans? If you believe that races change under the influence of the geography in which they live, then all people in the same climatic conditions ought to exhibit the same racial characteristics.

If environmental conditions had influenced the emergence of races, then by that logic, as Canada receives less sunshine and is colder, Canadian Indigenous peoples ought to be fairer-haired than, say, the Danes. But such things only happen in fairy tales. Dr Reşit Galip's words represent the true and scientific aspect of this matter. Those who claim otherwise must answer the questions posed above.

Such studies and articles demonstrate that the founders of the Republic, led by Atatürk, firmly believed in a hierarchy among races. It is no coincidence that they claim the Turks originated from Central Asia, the cradle of the entire 'White race'. And this is indeed true when one considers very ancient history. For at that time, scientists were stating that the ancestors of all Europeans had emerged from Central Asia; indeed, most scientists still hold this view today. The only mistake made in this regard is their assumption that the state, whose actual name was Shunnu or Chunhu, was a 'Turkic state'. The reason for this is that the pioneers of Turkic studies either mistakenly or deliberately read this name as 'Hunnu'. However, experts in Chinese point out that ancient Chinese pronunciations have changed significantly over time, and some have been completely forgotten. In other words, even the Chinese themselves face difficulties in accurately interpreting their own history. The view that the Chunhu were Turks has not been accepted worldwide since 1945. Setting aside the period of the Aryan migrations, the Turks did not return to Central Asia until the 6th century AD. European historians' the claim that the Turks, who appeared in historical records in Europe as early as the 1st century AD, did not come to Central Asia from Europe but from some unknown part of Asia, is a situation that requires explanation. Masonic and liberal historians resort to this line of argument to support their claims that Europe is not composed of a pure White race and that racial mixing is insignificant. The aim of these studies is to destroy Europe by turning it into a racial melting pot. Turkey is among the countries they wish to destroy in this way. The fact that there are so many nationalists—including so-called Atatürk nationalists and patriots—who would be delighted to hear an Afghan or a Black person say 'I am Turkish' is significant in showing just how hollow Turkish nationalism has become, and it is also a tragic situation. For 'Turkification' can be applied to land, or to people provided they are of the same race. Atatürk did not say, 'Anyone who feels Turkish is a Turk'! There is a reason why Atatürk stated, 'The people who founded the Republic of Turkey are called the Turkish nation', and the texts above explain this reason.

TURANISM: THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE JEWS AND THE FREEMASONS

Turkish nationalism was not Turanist when it first emerged. It was French Jews and Freemasons who sought to introduce Turanism into Turkish nationalism. It is no coincidence that, in the 19th century and around the same period, Turanists in the Ottoman Empire emerged alongside those who argued that Turks should return to Central Asia to establish a Turan state. This is because the Russian Tsardom, unlike the rest of Europe, was still resisting the ideals of the French Revolution

(1789). Following the French Revolution, efforts to eliminate Christianity had begun, and a false religion had even been invented. History books dealing with the French Revolution make almost no mention of this, yet it is one of the most significant outcomes and crucial aspects of the French Revolution. Another important consequence is the transfer of capital, which they do mention. However, they describe it differently.

Consequently, the attempt to establish a false religion had not taken hold in France, but the anti-Christian wave spreading from France had even had an impact in Spain; this is why, by the end of the 19th century, Spain was divided by the Carlist Wars. Russia, on the other hand, remained annoyingly Christian and hostile to liberalism. Moreover, capital was still in the hands of the Russians and the traditionalists. The Central Bank, too, was still entirely the property of the Russian State.

It was not private (as in America) or semi-private (as in Europe), as was the case in the West. For this reason, the Russian Tsardom had to be overthrown; the Turks and the Russians had to go to war. But how could this happen whilst the Turks still regarded themselves as a Balkan state

despite territorial losses, and whilst the Balkans remained under Turkish control? To this end, they began to work on the Turkish and Muslim minorities in Russia.

They created a 'Turan' fantasy, an illusion, utilising some Turks and other Muslims with no connection to Turkishness. In France, the new regime, following the Revolution, set about both consolidating its power and spreading its ideology abroad. Russia was among the target countries. It is generally accepted that interest in the Turkic peoples – or, in other words, the Central Asians – began in Turkey in the 1890s.

The Turkish translation (1896) by Necip Asım Yazıksız of the book *An Introduction to Asian History: The Turks and the Mongols* by Léon Cahun—a historian holding a French passport but who was, in fact, Jewish—is regarded as the beginning of the Turanist movement. The concept of 'Turan', which previously held no particular significance in Turkish, acquired a political dimension thanks to Cahun's book.

The Jews' Interest in the Turks and Turanism

The Hungarian Turkologist, Prof. Dr Arminius Vambery—who was, in fact, Jewish—is regarded by some as one of the greatest Turkologists of all time. This individual, having spent four years at the Istanbul residence of Mehmed Sadık Rıfat Pasha under the pseudonym 'Reşat Efendi', undertook a three-

year journey (1862–1865) to Turkestan. A comprehensive work he wrote following his journey was published in London in 1864. Cemal Kutay assessed Vambery's journey in his work *The False Dervish*; whilst Mim Kemal Öke, in his book *Vambery: The Life Story of an International Spy, Documented*, highlighted his activities during his time in Istanbul and his connections to Zionism.

Even after his journey to Turkestan, Vambery remained interested in Pan-Turkism until his death (d. 1913), and sent many of his works and lecture notes to the Turkish Cultural Associations (Yılmaz, 2005). Professor Dr Mehmet Eroz, one of the leading figures in the ideology of Turkish nationalism, also acknowledges Vambery's role as a propagator of this ideology and states that the ideology known as 'Pan-Turkism' was supported by the British with the aim of halting Russian expansion in Central Asia. Eroz adds that the British were deeply concerned that this ideology would subsequently be encouraged by the Germans (Eroz, 1977: 289–290). Indeed, the so-called 'Turkish nationalist' Committee of Union and Progress later fell under German influence and dragged the Ottoman Empire into the First World War. Eroz may be right in stating that the British aim was to halt the Russian advance. At this point, it should be noted that, at that time, the Russian Tsardom was one of two states in Europe not controlled by the Jews. The other was Germany. Despite their considerable influence in that country, the Jews would not be able to bring it fully under their control until the end of the Second World War.

Finally, let us mention that Professor Dr Arminius Vambery, who made significant contributions to the Turanist Turkish nationalists in Turkey, was sent to Istanbul on a diplomatic mission by Theodor Herzl, the founder of Zionism. According to Theodor Herzl, Professor Vambery was also a British agent.

The timing of the studies linking the Turks to Central Asia, and the fact that those who initiated these studies were Jewish, is no coincidence. Alongside Vambery, who established Pan-Turkism as a system, there is another figure who must be mentioned. The French Jewish Turkologist Leonard Cahun is another Jew who laid the foundations of the so-called 'Pan-Turkist' ideology. Just a few years after Vambery published his work *Sketches of Central Asia*, he published his book *An Introduction to Asian History: The Origins of the Turks and Mongols*, which was also translated into Turkish in 1896. During this period, the Zionists were working to bring down the Ottoman Empire and Russia. From the Zionists' perspective, the best possible outcome would be for these two great powers to destroy one another through war. Moreover, Zionist ideologues such as Moshe Hess openly stated that the collapse of the Ottoman Empire would pave the way for the establishment of a new Jewish state in Jerusalem. In his work *European Triarchy*, published in 1841, Moshe Hess advocated for the union of three European powers: Germany, Britain and France. In his own words: "These three powers must unite against Russia, the source of reactionary forces and the home of barbaric oppression that threatens to devour Europe and trample upon its freedoms." Calls for unity against Russia, portrayed as the West's enemy, soon spread to Germany and even to other parts of Europe. But a problem soon arose.

The interests of Britain, Germany and France began to clash. Moreover, the presence of a significant Jewish population in Eastern Europe, particularly in Poland, prompted Jewish leaders to reconsider their stance. This was because the Jews living in these countries held considerable influence there and played important roles in their economies. In the event of a war between Russia and the West, not only the lives but also the wealth of the Jews living in these regions would be at risk. For these reasons, it was decided that the war with Russia should take place on other territories, and that Russia should be pitted against another country. The Ottoman Empire was chosen as that country. Turanism, meanwhile, is a useful ideology for the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. We suggest you evaluate the intervention of Britain and France in the Crimean War to aid the Ottomans in the light of Moshe Hess's proposals outlined above.

The Crimean War and the efforts to link the Turks to Central Asia took place in successive periods. Hess published his book in 1841, whilst the Crimean War broke out in 1853. Vambery published his works in 1868, and Cahun in 1875. Long before Herzl, Hess stated: 'The Jews have a historical right to a homeland. The Turks might grant permission for the Jews' return to Jerusalem in exchange for a handful of gold (or perhaps a sum of gold obtained through a more noble method, such as a democratic donation from the entire Jewish people). Perhaps the French and the Jews should join forces, together revitalise the arid lands of Palestine and liberate it from the dreadful Turks."

We know what happened next. One of Hess's proposals was implemented exactly as suggested, and fifty years later, in 1890, Jewish bankers, through Herzl, offered to purchase Jerusalem in exchange for the Ottoman debts. It was precisely during this period—and this, too, must have been a coincidence—that a man named Ismail Gasprinsky (Gaspralı) emerged in Crimea. His father was both an officer in the Russian army and a member of the Russian nobility. Gasprinsky also enrolled at the Russian Military Academy. According to some accounts, Gasprinsky set out to support the Ottomans during the Crete uprising but was arrested in Odessa and expelled from the academy. In reality, however, the reason for Gasprinsky's expulsion was his involvement in Masonic activities. Indeed, when he left Russia four years later, his first destination was France. The year was 1872. This was the period when Jews began attempting to sell the idea of 'Turan' to the Turks. In parallel with Moshe Hess's plan to destroy Russia he returned to Crimea and began his work.

At the start of the 1900s, Jews who did not wish to leave matters to chance were, on the one hand, attempting to incite the Turks against the Russians by exploiting Turanism, whilst on the other hand, they were attempting to incite the Russians against the Turks. This was because the seeds of Turanism had not yet taken root and the Committee of Union and Progress had not yet come to power. The Jews, however, wanted the Ottoman Empire to be destroyed at any cost.

For Britain and France, entering into a decisive war with the Ottoman Empire in the Middle East was impossible at that time. The British had in mind the idea of granting the Jews a state in Africa. And despite all their power in Britain and France, the Jews could not, at that time, persuade these countries to go to war against the Ottomans solely for the sake of Palestine.

When it became clear that the Turks would not cede land to the Jews in exchange for money, Herzl decided to try his luck in Russia. In 1903, Herzl travelled to meet the Russian Tsar and asked Russia to put pressure on the Ottomans to hand over Palestine to the Jews. At a famous meeting, Herzl met with Count von Plehve, whom he knew to be anti-Semitic. During his meeting with von Plehve, Herzl argued that Zionism was the solution to Russia's 'Jewish question'. Russia, however, had no intention of going to war with the Turks over the Jews. Yet the actions of the Zionists are significant in that they shed light on both the policies of that era and those of today.

We could elaborate further on this topic and provide examples, but let us leave it at that for now. Ultimately, Turkish nationalism had emerged to save the Ottoman Empire—or, more accurately, what remained of it. But with the emergence of Turanism, a host of 'so-called nationalists' suddenly appeared, abandoning their duties to pursue the notion of uniting with their 'so-called brothers' in Central Asia—people they had not seen for a thousand years. The first to embrace Turanism were the Committee of Union and Progress. In pursuit of this cause, they ceded thousands of square kilometres of territory to the Bulgarians before the First World War. During the First World War, they were responsible for the deaths of 650,000 Turkish soldiers. Tens of thousands of soldiers were also left disabled. As for the civilian population, approximately 300,000 lost their lives due to various causes such as starvation and epidemics.

We have already touched upon Moshe Hess's views above. It had been decided that if the Ottomans did not cede Jewish lands in exchange for money, they would be seized by force. Although France had initially been considered at the time, this idea was later abandoned on the grounds that it might be easier to pit the Turks against the Russians; and the Turks were driven into war against Russia by the Committee of Union and Progress and the Turanists. To this end, 'so-called pan-Turkist' books were written first in France and then in Hungary. The Jews spent considerable sums of money to spread these ideas. They first targeted the Crimean Turks through the Freemasons. This was because there were, in reality, very few Turks in Russia, and most of those Turks were in Crimea. Furthermore, Crimea was former Ottoman territory and was close to Istanbul. Moreover, the Turks did not recognise the concept of 'Central Asian Turkicness'. Moreover, the Turks had been massacred twice by invaders from Central Asia. Setting that aside, the Ottoman intelligentsia had no interest in Turan. They were aware that the Ottoman Empire lacked the power to pursue such a project. For these reasons, Russia was initially chosen as the centre. Consequently, Sadri Maksudi Arsal, who had met Gasprali in Russia and, through him, other Freemasons, was tasked with spreading this idea within the Ottoman Empire. Both men received training in France whilst they were there for this purpose. This is, in fact, how they were introduced to Turanism. They adopted the idea of Turanism from French Jews. Subsequently, the groundwork for this was first laid in Russia.

Measures were taken to ensure that first Gasprali, and then Arsal, gained a certain degree of recognition and recruited new supporters. At the same time, they were also working to promote the Turanist movement within the Ottoman Empire. Cahun and Vambery's books and works were immediately translated into Turkish. John Robert, a historian specialising in the First World War and Zionism, states the following in his book *The Backstory of the Balfour Declaration – Britain's Promise of the Great War to the Rothschild Bankers*: "In Turkey, the 1908 'Young Turk' (Committee of Union and Progress) revolution in Turkey was, on the surface, a popular movement opposing foreign influence. However, the Jews and the so-called 'Dönme'—secret Jews—had played a leading role in the Revolution."

Now perhaps you understand why the Unionists and Ziya Gökalp kept harping on about 'Turan, Turan', and why they handed over Turkish territories to the Bulgarians as early as 1913 under the guise of 'border adjustments'. The West (including Europe and America) wanted a war anyway, and this decision had been made some ten years earlier.

Nahum Sokolow and Chaim Weizmann, who would play a role in the signing of the Balfour Declaration in 1917 and in America's entry into the war, had held a meeting as early as 1904 regarding the necessity for the Ottoman Empire to enter the war on the opposing side. This was the same year that the Triple Entente between Britain, France and Russia against Germany was signed. In other words, the decision to go to war had long since been made. During this meeting, Nahum Sokolow and Chaim Weizmann discussed the necessity of the Ottoman Empire joining the war on the opposing side and the steps that needed to be taken to achieve this. The Ottoman Empire had to be dragged into the war so that it could be dismantled. To this end, the Ottomans had to fight on the opposing side and against Russia. Admittedly, this meant the Ottomans would also have to fight against the Entente Powers (that is, against them), but so be it.

The lives of the French and British who would die for the sake of the Jews were of no consequence. It had already been calculated that Russia could easily finish off the Ottomans. Indeed, the Russian army would go on to occupy almost half of Anatolia during the war. Had there not been a civil war and a revolution in Russia, they might even have taken Istanbul. But do not mistake this for a desire for a Russian victory. Hadn't the Jews set out on paper, as mentioned above, what needed to be done to bring about Russia's collapse? Yes. In reality, what they wanted was for the two states to fight and annihilate one another.

The Turanists were so keen to go to war with Russia that they handed over Western Thrace to the Bulgarians without firing a single shot. Yet the international political situation was favourable for the Turks to retain these territories. Even Greece preferred that Western Thrace remain in Turkish hands rather than under Bulgarian rule. Moreover, the Turkish government established in Western Thrace had also raised an army of 30,000 men.

But the Committee of Union and Progress had already set their minds on waging war against Russia for the sake of Turan as early as 1913. They had received such orders from their lodges. For this reason, they deemed it more appropriate to hand over hundreds of thousands of Turks and 4,000 square kilometres of territory to the Bulgarians in 1913. According to the claim of Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, who was a Turanist at the time (though he later expressed regret), a total of 4,000 square kilometres of Turkish territory was ceded to Bulgaria: 2,500 square kilometres west of the Meriç River and 1,500 square kilometres along the Black Sea coast. Whilst some authors cite Aydemir's statement, all other sources indicate that the amount of territory lost was significantly higher. To be precise: 8,578 square kilometres!

The borders of the Turkish Republic of Western Thrace and the territories ceded to Bulgaria. Only a portion of the small grey area on the far right, lying east of the Midye–Enez line, remained under our control; the entirety of the remaining territory was ceded to Bulgaria.

We had previously noted that the Jews wanted the Turks to enter the war on the side of the Germans. In other words, there was no question of Turkey being admitted to the Triple Entente. So, could Turkey have avoided entering the war? Those seeking to exonerate the Committee of Union and Progress, Enver and the Pan-Turkists claim that entering the war was inevitable for Turkey. But this is not true. From letters sent by Atatürk from Sofia to his classmate, Staff Lieutenant Colonel Ali Fuat (Cebesoy), who was stationed in Damascus, at the beginning of 1914, before the war began:

'It is plain to see what state we have been reduced to by our leaders, who, out of recklessness and ignorance, sacrificed the largest part of the country in the belief that they would not sacrifice the small part that was about to be lost, and who were driven by their greed for position and fame. Consequently, I see no need for further explanation on this matter.

There should be no doubt that we shall face even worse days ahead. Even as the suffering we have endured at the hands of our Christian subjects for centuries has not yet come to an end, the conflicting fantasies of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Turanism have been invented, and these are further complicating our already precarious situation.

Nationalism has developed to such an extent across the world that you may be certain the disintegration of states not based on a national majority is considered inevitable.

***

It is plausible to believe that a world war will break out very soon. If we are dragged into this war in haste, without any preparations, our Anatolia, our Straits and our 500-year-old Turkish Istanbul will certainly be in danger. This time, in a word, our Turkish identity will be destroyed. From now on, at the very least, we must not allow ourselves to be carried away by illusions.

For we would face a catastrophe from which there would be no recovery. In the future, without being misled by any sentiments, our firm resolve must be that the borders drawn by the Turkish majority should form the cornerstone of both our foreign policy and our defence."

According to Kazım Karabekir, too, war was not inevitable despite everything, and Turkey could have avoided entering the war if it so chose.

From a meeting Albert Einstein held with prominent Zionist leaders during his visit to America in 1921. From left to right: Ben Zion Mossessohn, Albert Einstein, Chaim Weizmann and Menachem Ussishkin. Was Einstein subjected to an investigation because he was Jewish, or because he collaborated with Zionist leaders? Einstein renounced his German citizenship in 1916 to avoid conscription; once the possibility of being called up had been ruled out, he reapplied for German citizenship in 1917.

The Contributions of the Freemasons

Russian documents record that so-called Turkic-nationalist Turanists such as Ismail Gasprali and Sadri Maksudi Arsal were Freemasons. In documents examining the activities of Freemasons in Russia, the names of these two prominent so-called Turkic-nationalists are mentioned alongside those of the Russian Freemasons of the period. It was Ismail Gasprinsky who first put forward the idea of Turanism. He would not come to be known by the surname 'Gasprali' until much later. Ismail Gasprinsky's father, a member of the Russian aristocracy, was an officer in the Russian army. In 1865, Ismail Gasprinsky enrolled at the Military Academy to become a Russian officer like his father. It is rumoured that in 1867, during the Crete Uprising, he deserted the military academy to fight alongside the Ottoman army, but was expelled from the Military Academy after being captured in Odessa. Ismail Gasprinsky, who is said to have always harboured the dream of 'becoming an Ottoman officer', curiously undertook his first trip abroad to France in 1872.

There are various rumours circulating about him. According to one view, he had made contact with Islamist circles in Moscow, which led to his expulsion from the Military Academy. His contact with the Freemasons, however, is said to have taken place during his time in France. Another rumour suggests that he was expelled from the Military Academy during his time there due to his connections with Masonic circles. His subsequent journey to France was also for this reason. It is also significant that Sadri Maksudi Arsal decided to go to France after meeting him.

Born in the city of Kazan in Russia, Sadri Maksudi Arsal attended primary school there before going on to Teacher Training College, from which he graduated in 1895. His elder brother, Hadi Efendi, was friends with the so-called Turkish nationalist Ismail Gasprinsky (Gaspralı) – who was, in fact, a Freemason – and corresponded with him frequently. At Ismail Gasprinsky's request, he took his brother to Crimea to meet him. Influenced by Ismail Gasprinsky, Sadri Maksudi Arsal decided to pursue his university education in France. Maksudi Arsal initially addressed the concept of 'race' in relation to nationalism, attaching particular importance to the subject of race.

He states that he uses the word 'race' in the sense of 'race' in European languages, and 'nation' in the sense of 'nationalité'. However, he later begins to use the concept of race in place of ethnicity as well. Race is a biological unit that, apart from differing in physical characteristics and brain structures, also encompasses distinct disease traits. However, Arsal confuses 'race' with 'ethnicity'—a phenomenon that is entirely linguistic, cultural and historical—and uses them as if they were the same thing. In doing so, he distorts the concepts of 'nation' and 'race', thereby emptying them of their meaning. The reason for this is the instructions he received from his Jewish and Masonic masters.

"Since nations have been intermingling since prehistoric times, today virtually no nation's

individuals all possess the characteristics of the race to which that nation belongs. However, the prototypical examples representing a race are the types most commonly found within that nation. We believe that a Turkish race with specific physical characteristics exists on this earth. However, we cannot claim that everyone who speaks the Turkish language today, and whom we consider to be Turkish at heart, possesses the physical characteristics considered specific to the Turkish ethnic group. The Turkish race may also have intermingled to a greater or lesser extent with certain other races, such as the Chinese, Mongols, Iranians or Arabs. For this reason, it is natural that there are individuals within Turkish communities today who do not possess the physical characteristics specific to Turks" (Arsal 1979: 33–34). Just look at that.

At this point, we would like to address the subject of 'race'. The term 'race' is a scientific concept used to describe human populations that are historically and geographically distinct, similar in terms of their biological and physical characteristics, and share a common gene pool. In other words, it is based on 'biological characteristics'. Biological characteristics, in turn, are observable traits. However, it is not just physical characteristics; personality traits, intelligence or diseases also differ between races. Whilst certain diseases are more prevalent in some races, they are not found at all in others.

As you may recall, there was some debate in 2020–2021 regarding the effects of Covid vaccines on 'Black people'. Furthermore, every race has a different 'worldview'. Culture is the sum total of all the works produced by humankind, whether material or spiritual. For example, means of production, everyday tools and utensils, musical instruments, architectural structures, etc., are elements of material culture. Elements of spiritual culture, on the other hand, include the beliefs, ideas, knowledge, rules of behaviour, customs and customs that arise within a society. However, culture is first shaped in the mind; its outward manifestation follows later. The occurrence of cannibalism in certain communities possessing specific biological characteristics is an example of this. For instance, cannibalism is generally part of the cultures of the Pacific Islands, whether the people are Black or not.

Although races have been categorised in several different ways, the most widely accepted classification is: White (Aryan), Yellow (Mongoloid), Brown (India, Pakistan), and Coloured races (Afghans, Arabs, Native Americans, Pacific Islanders, etc.). Naturally, these are further subdivided into their own sub-groups. A Native American and an Afghan have absolutely nothing in common. But we didn't want to go into too much detail and drag it out. Yes, nations may indeed have different gene pools. However, even among nations of the same race (such as the Spanish, the French and the Turks), there may be certain differences, and these differences are reflected in their cultures. Although the Turks, the French and the Germans are all nations with their own distinctive characteristics, they also share some important common traits. However, these differences are of little significance. This is because they largely share the same genes and, consequently, largely the same characteristics. For example, whilst cannibalism is never seen in Europe, it can be observed in Black Africa or on the Pacific islands. Despite being quite far from Africa—and indeed situated on the coast of India— the fact that the black Sentinelese people living on the Sentinel Islands practise cannibalism serves as a good example to illustrate the link between race and culture.

This was precisely what the Freemason Sadri Maksudi Arsal set out to do: to strip the term 'race'—a biological concept—of its meaning. What a contradiction it is to say, "We believe that a Turkish race with specific physical characteristics exists on this earth," and then to add, "But today, we cannot claim that everyone who speaks the Turkish language and whom we consider to be Turkish at heart possesses the physical characteristics attributed to the Turkish ethnic group."

In other words, he "acknowledges that these people are not of Turkish descent, yet still says 'we consider them Turkish as well'." Moreover, this is not a small group that is racially distinct from the Turks. What is at issue is a population that is, to a significant extent, mixed-race. The population he refers to when he says, "The Turkish race may also have intermingled to a greater or lesser extent with certain other races, such as the Chinese, Mongols, Iranians or Arabs," is larger than the Turkish population itself. If you were to accept as Turkish people from every race, every tribe and every colour, this would ultimately lead to the Turkish lineage drying up and becoming extinct. Today, all that remains of the Aryans in India are their languages! Of course, Arsal was not alone in this field. In other countries too, Freemasons and Jews either attacked the concept of race directly, or sought to devalue it by altering its definition and hollowing out its substance.

Every nation has a distinct national character. By 'national character' is meant the common qualities and tendencies shared by all members of a nation—those traits that are generally prevalent amongst them. Arsal states the following: 'Admittedly, in no nation has it ever been observed that all individuals think or act in exactly the same way on every matter. For just as not everyone in a society is at the same level of spiritual development, neither do they all possess the same hereditary traits or the same abilities. However, in well-established nations, experience and observation demonstrate that, despite differences in intellectual ability amongst individuals, there are certain general and shared psychological tendencies that apply to all members of the nation. It is the sum total of these that we call the 'national character'. The national character manifests itself in tendencies to act in the same way in certain situations, to feel the same way in the face of certain events, and to place the same value on certain things. For example, all individuals belonging to the modern British nation undoubtedly possess very different individual characteristics and psychological tendencies. Similarly, every French person has a psychological world (a world of wishes, desires, love and hatred) distinct from that of others. Yet an English person's behaviour, attitude and reactions differ from those of a French person. 'The characteristics found among the English constitute the English national character; those observed among the French constitute the French national character.' (Arsal 1979: 83–84).

Actually, that much is fine. But what follows is problematic. How can people who do not belong to the same race and possess different genetic traits share the same national character? Even as individuals, are we not influenced by the genes we inherit from our parents? Who would want to have a child with a woman or a man who could be described as 'foolish'? So, in this sense, what sort of common ground could there be between the Turks and the Kyrgyz, Kazakhs and so on—who have intermingled with different races, become mixed-race, and evolved into entirely different people, races and nations?

What sort of common ground could they possibly have? How could there be any similarity between the descendants of those who founded the Seljuk and Ottoman empires and the descendants of Timur—who built towers out of skulls, sometimes massacred entire cities through torture, burnt libraries and raped women?

Maksudi Arsal: "For example, within the Slavic race there are nations that differ from one another in terms of their history, languages, places of residence and political organisation; Russians, Poles, Czechs, Serbs, etc. Similarly, within the Turkic race there are groups that speak different dialects;

Anatolian Turks, Uzbeks, Turkmen, Kyrgyz, Kara-Kyrgyz, Uyghurs, Crimean Turks, Kazan Turks, etc... All of these belong to the Turkish race in a social sense," he says. Yet the Slavs are, to a greater or lesser extent, similar to one another. Whereas a Kyrgyz and a Turk have absolutely nothing in common. One way to determine whether the peoples of Central Asia are Turkic is to compare them with yourself. If they resemble you, there is no problem. But if what you see in the mirror differs physically—that is, racially—from an Asian Turk, then there has been some confusion on one side or the other.

Either you are not a Turk (in which case practising Turkish nationalism would be meaningless), or that Turk is not a Turk (in which case, practising Turanism would also be pointless). After all, race is a biological, not a social, construct.

From intelligence to diseases, and even talents, many things are passed on to people through heredity. If you are a father of Turkish descent, but your child is Black or Mongoloid, this can only mean one thing: either there has been a mix-up at the hospital, or you've been badly cuckolded.

In the statements above, you can see how Arsal, who was educated in France, has hollowed out the concept of 'nation'. It is clear that this distortion is deliberate. In fact, what he is doing here is redefining Turkishness. Through this definition, it can be seen that Maksudi Arsal is, as it were, defining the post-nation-state 'New World Order'. Those in their forties will will recall that in the early 2000s, books claiming that the Turkish nation was a fabricated construct were distributed through EU embassies and Soros-backed foundations. This is because in the 'New World Order', there is no place for different races, nations or nation-states, and Turkey is the target. It was like this in the past, and it is like this today. And they will not stop until Turkey is destroyed.

The concepts of race, ethnic group and nation will also be distorted by so-called Turkish nationalists in the future, and will be incorrectly used interchangeably. Today in Turkey, everyone from so-called academics to journalists tends to misuse the concepts of race, nation and/or ethnic group—whether knowingly or unknowingly—thereby misleading people. In these days when it has come to light that America has been funding liberals through USAID since the 1960s, we should not really be too surprised by this. Turanism reached the Ottoman Empire as a result of such a process, under the influence of Jews and Freemasons. Of course, we should not blame only the Americans and the Jews. The Ottoman Empire's structure, which was disconnected from the Turkish people and Turkish identity, also helped this distorted ideology to take root in Ottoman society. Subsequently, the dominance of Turanism in Turkey—challenging Atatürk and Turkish nationalism—was made possible thanks to the Americans, and once again, the Jews and Freemasons. To İsmet İnönü, who entrusted Turkish national education and the training of the Turkish army to America, and to Adnan Menderes, who purged the Kemalist officers remaining from the Atatürk era from the Turkish army, thereby causing the army to come under American control… And yet we call these men heroes. What a pity.

In fact, there was no initial intention behind the misuse of the term 'race' in Turkey.

When the constitution of the Turkish Cultural Associations was first drafted, the Turkish nationalists did not wish to use the word 'millet'. This was because, at that time, the concept of 'millet' was used more in the sense of 'community'. For this reason, they preferred to use 'race' instead of 'millet'. In fact, this was not entirely correct either. However, at that time, there were no alternative terms available to replace 'ethnicity' or 'nation', and it was understandable that the concept of 'race' was favoured to emphasise lineage. Later, however, with the language reform, Turkish terms began to be coined, and the concept of 'Ulus' came into use as the equivalent of 'nation'.

It was Atatürk who first used the concept of "ulus". From this point onwards, we too will use the terms "ulus" instead of "millet" and "ulusalcılık" instead of "milliyetçilik".

NOT TURKISH NATIONALISM, BUT A DIFFERENT KIND OF OTTOMANISM

In the Ottoman Empire, the emergence of 'nationalism without a nation'—that is, Turanism detached from racial and blood ties—and its continued existence in Turkey were, of course, not solely due to the Jews. The Ottoman state structure and the culture stemming from it also played a significant role in this. Turanism—that is, the idea of extending influence to Central Asia, and reaching out to the Muslim peoples there who were claimed to be Turkish, was almost immediately accepted by a section of the Ottoman intelligentsia when it arrived in the Ottoman Empire under the banner of Turkish nationalism. A key factor in this was that the concept of the 'ummah' (Muslim community), rather than that of the 'nation', still prevailed in the Ottoman Empire. Ottomanism was a medieval ideology rooted in religion and culture, dating back to the Byzantine period. Some of the intellectuals referred to as 'Turkists' in the Ottoman Empire had still not embraced the idea of Turkishness. In their view, the religion-based system of nationhood was still valid. To be Muslim was to be Ottoman. Muslims deemed to be within the sphere of Ottoman culture were, in a sense, Ottoman. Or rather, they were capable of becoming Ottomanised. Being Turkish, however, was of no consequence. It was precisely this logic that had led Yavuz Sultan Selim to be the first to bring Kurds to Anatolia, at the expense of the Alevi Turks (and Armenians) of that period. This was also the underlying reason why the Committee of Union and Progress, deeming the Armenian population in Anatolia to be too large, subsequently imported Kurds from Iran and Iraq into Anatolia to balance the Armenian population in Eastern Anatolia. The root of the Armenian-Kurdish conflict also lies in the struggle for dominance over these lands. This is also the underlying reason behind the allegations that PKK leaders are 'Armenian'.

Consequently, the idea that Central Asian peoples—who did not resemble the Turks and possessed their own languages, cultures and histories—could be considered Turkish, that is, could in fact be 'Ottomanised', gained acceptance within the Ottoman Empire. And almost

a section of Ottoman intellectuals, who had never seen a Kazakh or a Kyrgyz in their lives, embraced this peculiar nationalist ideology. Numerous peoples with absolutely no racial, cultural or linguistic ties to the Turks—and with whom the Turks had had no contact for at least 1,000 years—were deemed to be Turks. In reality, this 'nationalism' was not nationalism at all, but rather Ottomanism dressed up in the guise of 'Turkish nationalism'. Those who first put forward the idea of 'Turkism' were, in fact, Jews and Freemasons. As sufficient research has already been carried out on this subject by Islamists, we shall content ourselves with just a few brief examples for now. Of course, the Islamists examining these issues have a different agenda. Their aim is to criticise nationalism in order to pave the way for pan-Islamism. The reason they do this is that their Jewish and American masters have instructed them to do so. As the Islamists' hostility towards nationalism also suits the Arabs, the Arabs are funding them as well.

The Jews plan it, the Americans organise it, and it is financed through the Arabs. However, part of the money that the Arabs channel to the Islamists also comes from America and the Jews. At the head of these Arabs are the Saudis.

We recommend that you read the book *Devil's Game: How the United States Helped Unleash Fundamentalist Islam* (American Empire Project) by Robert Dreyfuss, the former Middle East intelligence director of the LaRouche Movement. There are, in fact, many sources on this subject, but we recommend reading this one first as it was written by someone directly involved in the matter and one of the key figures at the very top. It contains important information on why Islamists, rather than nationalists, were supported against communism, the role of the Jews, and so on. We believe this work may also give you an insight into the reasons behind the creation of the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis and a form of nationalism not rooted in the nation-state.

To those who sympathise with concepts such as 'ummah-ism', nationalism and 'synthesis', the only thing we can say is that they must not forget that, in the eyes of Arabs who consider themselves the 'Noble Nation' and look down upon non-Arabs, Turks hold no value. For those seeking an example, they can read about how Arabs treat the Muslims they employ in their own countries.

Races of Mankind. From left to right: White / Aryan. Also known as Caucasian. Georgian. Kyrgyz. Second row: Dravidian (India). Chinese. Japanese. Malay. Third row: Tahitian. Samoan. New Zealander. Taken from *Illustrated World History* (Ward Lock, 1880).

ATATÜRK AND THE CONCEPT OF TURKISH NATIONALISM

"Throughout history, there has been no evidence that Pan-Islamist or Turanist policies have succeeded, nor that such unions have materialised. The outcomes of the dreams of establishing a single world state encompassing all of humanity, regardless of racial differences, have also been consigned to history. Ambitions to act as conquerors also lie outside the scope of our subject.

The theory of establishing a humane state by making people forget all personal feelings and allegiances and uniting them in complete brotherhood and equality also has its own conditions.

The only political principle in which we see clarity and the possibility of implementation is national policy. Given the world's current general conditions and the realities ingrained in minds and characters over the centuries, there can be no greater fallacy than to be a dreamer. This is what history tells us; this is what science, reason and logic show us.

For our nation to live in strength, happiness and stability, the state must pursue a wholly national policy; this policy must fully conform to and be based upon our internal structure and constitution. What I mean by 'national policy' is this: within our national borders, first and foremost, to preserve our existence by relying on our own strength, whilst striving for the true happiness and prosperity of the nation and the homeland… and not to harm the nation by exhausting it in the pursuit of meaningless goals." Nutuk, 6.

If one pays attention here, one will see that Atatürk uses the term 'races', not 'nations' or 'ethnic groups'. Arabs are a dark-skinned, distinct race. Central Asians, on the other hand, belong to the Mongoloid races of Asia. And in this speech, Atatürk explicitly criticises both Islamism and Turanism, and states that racial differences must also be taken into account. Furthermore, national identities and cultural differences that have developed over the course of history were cited as other factors hindering such unity, and he emphasised that each people's own history, culture and the distinct desires and aspirations formed during this process cannot be eradicated.

Mustafa Kemal Atatürk's definition of the nation is as follows: "A nation is defined as a community formed by the union of people who possess a rich heritage, who share a sincere common desire to live together, and whose wills are united in continuing to preserve that shared heritage. The natural and historical factors seen to have played a role in the formation of the Turkish nation are as follows: unity in political existence, linguistic unity, territorial unity, unity of race and origin, historical affinity and moral affinity."

What "rich heritage of memories" and what "unity of language, homeland, race and origin, historical affinity, etc." exist between the peoples of the so-called Turkic Republics of Central Asia and the Turks that they might be considered a single nation? Furthermore, the racial studies conducted during the Atatürk era and the emphasis on the 'White Race' also demonstrate what Atatürk thought in the context of 'race and Turkishness'.

The publication of works claiming that Atatürk was a Pan-Turkist, and the attribution of statements he never made to him, occurred after Turkey's accession to NATO and the deep-rooted establishment of American influence in Turkey.

Turkish nationalism was redefined, and a new understanding of Kemalism and nationalism was concocted to suit this new perspective. Following the coup of 12 September 1980, efforts were made to instil this understanding in the Turkish nation. This is why so many people who claim to be Kemalists today have fallen into the Pan-Turkist trap.

This means that these national and religious values have coexisted since the very founding of the New State. Indeed, the intellectuals who rallied around the *Dergâh* magazine—which began publication during the most fervent period of the *Kuvayı Milliye*—were united, regardless of the philosophical schools to which they belonged or how diverse their influences might have been, around two fundamental elements: Opposing a Gökalpist form of Turanism, which they believed would lead to outcomes contrary to realpolitik; and developing a vision of nationalism centred on Anatolia, grounded in religion and philosophy, and based on the Turkish identity that had united the people on the front lines of the War of Independence.

A CHALLENGE TO ATATÜRK'S UNDERSTANDING OF TURKISH NATIONALISM: TURANISM

Today in Turkey, the terms 'race', 'nation' and 'ethnicity' are incorrectly used interchangeably. Interestingly, so-called Turkish academics also use these terms incorrectly. Of course, this is not due to ignorance; it is deliberate. The education system has been shaped by pro-American Turkish politicians and, through them, by pro-American individuals who have had their minds washed whilst on Fulbright scholarships. Some of these academics may have deemed it more appropriate to say, 'many people think this way'. But a significant proportion of them are liars. They are not ignorant; they are liars. If you look at what they write and say about America, and at the American-perspective solutions they propose for Turkey's problems, you will see that this is the case. They have been trained to act as America's ambassadors (or rather, agents) in Turkey. Let us explain.

No anthropologist would ever claim that Turks of the Caucasian race and Mongoloid peoples (such as the Kyrgyz) belong to the same race. The foundations of this confusion were laid by so-called 'Turkic nationalists' such as N. Atsız. Anyone who makes such a claim is laughed at. It is not just anthropologists who laugh; doctors do too. This is because certain diseases are specific to certain races and occur more frequently among them. As you may recall from the debates during the Covid pandemic, not every medicine has the same effect on every race. Atatürk, however, used the term 'race' correctly, because he knew what 'race' actually meant.

What Atatürk did not do was practise racism. By establishing the Turkish Institute of Anthropology and commissioning racial studies on thousands of people, Atatürk had already engaged in more than enough racism. Moreover, he did not stop there; he also introduced numerous lessons in schools at the time covering the 'importance of race and the Turks'. What Atatürk did not practise was 'ethnic nationalism'. Unlike figures such as N. Atsız, he did not exclude the Laz, Circassians, Albanians, Georgians or Bosniaks. This is why Atatürk is described as a 'cultural nationalist'. The so-called definitions of 'ethnic German nationalism' and 'French cultural nationalism' were fabricated during the Second World War.

These concepts were subsequently adopted by so-called Turkish nationalists—the Turanists—and by so-called communists who opposed fascism.

The thesis (or rather, the claim) that there are so-called German and French-style nationalisms is not without merit. The aim is to create American-style, multiracial states in Europe and to dismantle nation-states. If you read the 'Alternative Right' publications in Europe and America, you will see what the 'Great Replacement' is all about. We call it the 'Alternative Right', but this is actually genuine 'Classical Right-wing' ideology! A normal conservative wishes, in turn, to protect their own race and nation. And, of course, their own natural resources, factories and so on. What is not normal is for someone claiming to be "Centre-Right" to flood their country with Africans, Arabs and the like, and sell everything—from banks to factories, fields and mines—to foreigners!

Zeki Velidov (Velidi Togan), a Turkic nationalist historian of Bashkir origin who later became a Turkish citizen, faced the backlash of Atatürk and the Turkish nationalists as a result of his objections to Reşit Galip regarding migrations from Central Asia, and was forced to resign from his university post and move to Vienna. Zeki Velidov, who also opposed the official Turkish historical thesis at the 1932 Turkish History Congress, was only able to return to Turkey in 1939, following Atatürk's death.

Mehmet Fuat Köprülü also criticised this historical thesis, which he did not accept, and was likewise forced to resign from his university post in 1932. N. Atsız, who served as his assistant during the same period, was dismissed from his post and exiled to a school in Malatya to work as a Turkish language teacher. He later criticised the Turkish Historical Thesis—which Atatürk himself supported—in the journal *Orhun* that he published; as a result, *Orhun* was shut down. These events have been erased from history solely to create an image of Atatürk as a Turkic nationalist. You will not even find any mention of why Fuat Köprülü left the university during this period in the pages of his biography.

There are, admittedly, one or two places where you might find it. But in one of them, the incident has been distorted. How Atsız—who opposed Atatürk's views on "race, history and nationalism"—was purged is either not mentioned at all in the sources recounting his life, or is presented in a distorted manner. As is well known, a Turkic nationalist version of Atatürk was required at that time. Yet Rıza Nur, who was also N. Atsız's teacher, was forced to flee abroad as early as 1926 due to his disagreements with Atatürk, and lived in France and Egypt until Atatürk's death

So in this situation, how accurate is it to chant the slogan: "We are Turks, we are Turkists, we are Atatürkists"?

Pan-Turkism is an ideology that took shape within the Ottoman intellectual framework. Yes, although Pan-Turkism and the idea of expansion into the East were embellished with Turkic motifs, they were based on an Ottomanist-Islamist foundation.

This is precisely what enabled the Jews to instill this ideology in a section of the Turkish population. This movement drew its main human resources from Sufi orders. It also trained its members who were not affiliated with any order at the Ülkü Ocakları, in line with the ideology of the Turkish-Islamic Synthesis. Close ties were established particularly with the Naqshbandi order, as this order was also highly influential in Central Asia. Furthermore, the United States calculated that it could exert influence over the Soviet Union through this order. The party of this so-called nationalist movement was, from its very inception, financed, trained and directed by the Americans and the CIA. A number of its leaders, foremost among them Türkeş, had in fact been trained at American military academies much earlier, whilst still students. A number of publications, ranging from reports by the Turkish-American Aid Commission to CIA documents, shed light on some of these operations. We learn of others from articles written by former American intelligence officers for various journals or from reports by think tanks in the United States.

In fact, this group—which comprised only a very small fraction of the intellectuals of that era and embraced Turanism—was, by its origins, generally rooted in a religious minority that was not of Turkish origin. The secular face of this movement, however, was represented by Freemasons who had no connection to Turkish nationalism. For this reason, they insisted on using the concept of 'millet', which also encompasses the term 'ümmet'. They opposed the Language Revolution and the movements to Turkify the language. Even those who claim, "We are Turkish nationalists in the tradition of Atatürk," defend words that have invaded the language by entering it from Arabic. For them, Atatürk is not a leader to be emulated, but one to be exploited. Lacking the courage to criticise him openly, they have attributed—and continue to attribute—words to Atatürk that he never actually spoke.

Above, we touched upon Atatürk's words and actions regarding Turanism. We also demonstrated how his research on race was swept under the carpet. Whilst even our so-called 'Atatürkist' intellectual leaders and enlightened figures lack the courage and character to defend Atatürk, it is actually our own mistake to expect honesty from the representatives of a Jewish-fabricated ideology.

Perhaps the underlying reason why this ideology, based on the concept of a great state, appealed to a certain section of the population was the feelings of inferiority and defeat arising from the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. But its leaders were not innocent. They knew exactly what they were doing. And Turanism became a tool of counter-revolution. By claiming that people of different races and ethnic origins were 'Turkish', both racial and ethnic identities were rendered obsolete. The foundations of Turkish nationalism were deliberately hollowed out.

'Turks' were invented from Native Americans right through to Afghanistan. We even witnessed a retired general on a television programme. Apparently, Urdu is said to derive from the Turkic language family.

Today, even so-called anti-Turanist liberals and left-wingers claim that Turkic-Turanists are racist. Yet, where there is no racial unity between two communities, there can be no question of ethnic unity or brotherhood either. There can be no racial connection between Turks of the Caucasian race and Mongoloid Asian peoples. No anthropologist or doctor would consider peoples so vastly different from one another to belong to the same ethnic group, let alone the same race. For one thing, different races have different health issues. Leaving hereditary diseases aside, a medicine suitable for one race may even be harmful to another. You can verify this even in Turkey. Go and get a first-year biology textbook from a medical school. The first thing you'll learn is that the concept of race is a biological one. In other words, factors such as climate, sunlight, etc., have no bearing on the formation of race.

In other words, race is not something that arises based on climate. When you become pregnant, go and have a genetic test carried out to check for any possible hereditary conditions in your child. They'll record your race there too. Not just to be on the safe side, but because race is a reality. Incidentally, new anthropology textbooks claim that race is a fabrication – that's a separate matter. Because the aim is brainwashing. But in situations where 'life' is at stake, such as in medicine, there is no place for nonsense, fairy tales or propaganda.

There will be those who claim we are 'racist' because of what we've written here. But don't pay them any mind. These types even claim that J.D. Vence, the American Vice-President whose wife is of Indian origin, and Alice Weidel, the former AFD leader and new chancellor candidate whose partner is Sri Lankan, are far-right (whatever that means) and racist. When reading certain Turkish journalists, one cannot help but be astonished at how they can spout such brazen and shameless lies. This is not ignorance on their part; they are quite simply acting as agents of the US deep state – no doubt out of nostalgia for the old days. But now that Trump has shut down USAID, their funding has dried up. Not immediately, but depending on Trump's success, their voices will be heard less and less. That is, unless Soros and his ilk continue to fund them.

No, we are not being racist. We do not claim that one group is superior to another. We say, 'not equal, but different'. What we wish to emphasise is that racial differences are real, and that Turks and the Turkic peoples of Central Asia do not share the same ancestry; they are neither brothers nor relatives. We are opposed to the creation of a society like that of America—one that is rootless, cultureless and devoid of history.

THOSE WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO TURANIST NATIONALISM BECOMING THE DOMINANT NATIONALIST PARADIGM

This so-called nationalism took root with German funds. Before and during the First World War; but particularly during the Second World War, it provided significant support to the Turanists in Turkey. During the Second World War, between 1939 and 1944, Nazi Germany, through its Consul-General in Turkey, Von Papen, provided the Turanists with 3 million Reichsmarks in aid – equivalent to 20 million euros in today's value.

During the Cold War, Turanist nationalism secured both financial and educational support from the United States. The Americans also provided millions of dollars to the Turanists (later known as the Ülkücüler), who claimed to be promoting Turkish nationalism. American support was not limited to this. With the transition to a multi-party system, two parties were established.

One of these was the Republican People's Party, led by Osman Bölükbaşı and known for its proximity to Alpaslan Türkeş and the Turanist faction; the other was the Turkish Peasants' Party, led by the Turkish nationalist Remzi Oğuz Arık, which represented the Anatolian line. Founded in 1952, the Turkish Peasants' Party began to grow rapidly. Although it was far removed from fascism, its programme contained elements reminiscent of Spanish Falangism. It placed great importance on the peasantry. The party was rapidly organising and gaining strength. It was widely expected to achieve significant success in the 1954 elections. He was travelling around the country for his election campaign. The aeroplane he boarded to travel to Ankara exploded in mid-air. Consequently, the political landscape in Turkey was reshaped. Unable to recover from the death of its leader, the Turkish Peasants' Party failed in the 1954 elections. During this period, the Turanists grew even stronger with American support. This can be regarded as the beginning of a series of mysterious deaths in Turkey. From that date onwards, many individuals who were, or might have been, influential in Turkish politics – including governors, former ministers, journalists, generals and politicians – died in mysterious road, aeroplane and helicopter accidents. Some were openly murdered.

Numerous Pan-Turkist publications were produced, advocating the claim that the peoples of Central Asia were Turkic. In fact, some of these peoples were indeed Turkic before they intermingled with the Chinese and Mongols and became assimilated. But that era was over. Nevertheless, publications along these lines were produced, and so-called scientific studies were published. Academic circles in the US that were allied with the Turks also made significant contributions to these efforts. In fact, as early as the time of İsmet İnönü, starting in 1943, history textbooks had begun to be revised. With the Fulbright Agreement signed with the United States in 1949, Turkish national education was entirely handed over to the Americans. Turkish history was rewritten. Of course, there were errors in the history textbooks of the Atatürk era as well. For example, the Asian Huns had been regarded as Turks. However, research carried out in 1945 revealed that the Asian Huns were neither Huns nor Turks.

If it is accepted that the Asian Huns were not Turks, then Turkish history should be traced back to the European Hun Empire—the first Turkish state established in Europe—or, more accurately, to the true Huns. So-called Turkish academics were either too lazy to read the vast amount of literature on the subject, or they were simply too busy.

In fact, from the 1940s onwards, a process initiated by the work of Otto Maenchen-Helfen had established that there was no such thing as the 'Asian Huns'; rather, they were nomadic barbarians led by a deposed Chinese emperor, and their name, derived from their leader, was 'Shunnu' or 'Chuhunnu'. This was because it was a state founded by Chunwei (Cunvey). Not only was the pronunciation of this name as 'Hunnu' incorrect, but—as subsequent genetic research has shown—it was also erroneous to regard them as Turkic. The man we translate as 'Mete' was not even called 'Modu Shanyu'. 冒顿单于

—that is, 'Mào Dùn Chán Yú'. Do you recognise 'Mao'? Mao Zedong, or Mao Tse Tung! The Turkish language, which derived 'Mao Zedong' from Mao Tse

Tung, had also turned 'Mao Dun' into 'Modun'. But that sounded like 'odun' (wood). That is why they called him 'Motun'. Later, they translated it as 'Mete'. His father was T'ou-man

(English pronunciation); the Chinese is 头曼 "Hóu màn", which became "Ho Man" for you as Teoman. Do you know Ho Chi Minh? He is the founding leader of Vietnam. Here is a brief history of the Turkification of the Mongoloid Xiongnu Empire. Don't do a general search on Google. Because it draws its data from published websites. You'll therefore be presented with the most widely published information. Just as when you look at American history, it provides information compiled from American websites; in this case too, the AI summarises information it has taken from websites published in Turkey as its reference. For this reason, search using specific names and details—such as Otto Maenchen-Helfen and the Huns—so that articles appear in your results. Even if the AI provides a summary, it should cite the original work as a reference. That aside, the 'Bibliography' at the end of the book contains a more detailed and extensive account of who the Chunhu people were. You can ignore Google and look there instead. In fact, we recommend that you read those sources. Once you start researching the information there in detail, you'll discover all sorts of other things, but never mind.

THE HOMELAND OF THE TURKS: EASTERN EUROPE

The theory that the homeland of the Turks is Central Asia is incorrect. Yes, the people who formed the ancestors of the Turks may well have emerged in Central Asia. But the same applies to the Germans, the Russians and all other European peoples. Because Central Asia is not only the place where the ancestors of the Turks emerged, but also that of all Europeans and the White race; and the Aryans/Whites set out from Central Asia and spread to various parts of the world.

Their last major migration, however, took place to India in the 2000s BC. It was they who established the caste system in India, a system which literally means 'colour'. The Indian Vedas also recount the war between the Aryans and the Dravidians, the dark-skinned indigenous peoples of India. However, the emergence of Buddhism in around the 5th century BC, and the adoption of Buddhism by the Indian Emperor Ashoka in 261 BC, shook the 'caste system', and over time, the Aryans intermingled with the indigenous peoples of India, becoming largely mixed-race and eventually disappearing. The caste system suffered a second blow with the Mongol invasions of the 1200s and 1300s. Today in India, nothing remains of the Aryans except their languages. This is why the Aryan languages have been referred to as Indo-Aryan, particularly since the 1950s. Underlying this designation is 'racial prejudice'. The term 'Indo-Europeans' actually referred to 'Whites', or 'Aryans' as they were commonly known at the time. The Indian Vedas recount the war waged by the Aryan tribes, who emerged from Central Asia, against the dark-skinned peoples of India in the 2000s BC. The Aryans who conquered India established the 'caste' system, a term meaning 'colour'. The Aryans imposed their culture and languages on the indigenous, dark-skinned people of India, the Dravidians, and established their dominance in India. However, Buddhism, which emerged around 500 BC, shook the caste system. In 250 BC, Emperor Ashoka, who controlled a significant part of India, adopted Buddhism, and the caste system was shaken. Inter-caste marriages began. The term 'caste' is derived from the Portuguese and Spanish word 'casta', which means 'race, lineage, gender' and originally meant 'pure or unmixed (stock or breed)'. Although not originally a Hindi word, it is widely used in English and other languages. In the West, however, the equation of 'caste' with 'race' began to be criticised from the 1950s onwards. Today, it is claimed that there is no longer any connection between caste and race. The Hindi terms for 'caste' are 'varna' and 'jati'. In the Indian context, the word "varna" literally means "colour" or "outward appearance".

"Jati", on the other hand, is used in the sense of lineage and refers to the lineage into which one is born. Therefore, the Spanish and Portuguese were not mistaken in their use of the term "caste". There is no error in the use of the word "caste".

Mummies discovered in the Tarim Basin in China in 1978, dating from between 2100 and 500 BC, also belong to people of the White race. One of these is the mummy known as the 'Beauty of Lolan', also described as the 'Grandmother of the Turks'. She has fair skin, coloured eyes and reddish hair.

The presence of Turks in Central Asia after this period is a matter of debate. The basis for the assumption that the Mongoloid Xiongnu were Turks lies in the fact that the term 匈奴 (Xiongnu), pronounced 'Xiongnu' in ancient Chinese, was either deliberately or mistakenly translated as 'Hunnu'. Given that Leon Cahun was Jewish

and the work carried out by Jews from that period to the present day, it is likely that this was intentional.

In Chinese historical records (The Book of Wu, AD 258), the name Chanwei is equated with the name Xunnu (or Chunhu). The true name of this state—which Western historians also once pronounced as 'Hunnu' due to a phonetic similarity—is the Shunnu State, and it has no connection to the Turks. The writings of Sima Qian, dating from 94 BC, state that Chanwei was a descendant of the Great Yu, founder of the Xia Dynasty, and the son of Jie (Che), the last emperor of the Xia Dynasty. The names Chanwei and Shunnu are sometimes used interchangeably. After the Xia Dynasty fell and was succeeded by the Shang Dynasty, Chanwei retreated northwards with his loyal followers; by bringing the northern tribes under his rule and uniting them, he founded the Xunnu Empire.

In historical chronicles dating from this period, which began in 200 BC, this people are referred to as the 'Xiongnu'. 'Xiongnu' is a compound word consisting of two distinct terms. The name "Xiongnu" is read as "Chunnu" or "Shunnu" in Chinese, and its meaning is very different from what Europeans refer to as the "Huns". The word "Chunnu" means "wild slave" in ancient Chinese. In the Chinese Great Histories describing this period, (Sima Qian), it is recorded that the Chunnu were descended from Chunwei, the son of Emperor Chye, the last emperor of the Xia Dynasty. However, there is another point that the historical records reveal: although the Shunnu Empire was predominantly composed of Mongoloid peoples, there were also a small number of tribes of Aryan origin within the empire.

Evidence obtained in recent times confirms that the vast majority of this population belonged to the Mongoloid 'yellow' race. Studies conducted following the emergence of genetic science indicate that 94 per cent of the state's population consisted of Mongoloid peoples. However, there were also people of the 'white' race amongst the population of the Xiongnu state. Although there is debate regarding the origins of these peoples, it is thought that this white minority ruled the empire for at least a period of time. Whilst it is claimed that a section of these Aryan peoples—who were part of the tribal federation forming the Xiongnu State—consisted of Turks, namely the Tiele tribes, there is no definitive evidence on this matter. Yes, there was a small Aryan minority active within this empire. However, it has not yet been clearly established whether they were Turkic. Furthermore, it is thought that the small number of Aryans present in this state—whose population was predominantly Yellow, consisting of Mongoloid people—may have belonged to different clans. What is certain is that the Xiongnu was an empire composed predominantly of Mongol peoples, and was not Turkic. Indeed, the term 'Xiongnu' means 'wild slave' in ancient Chinese, and no one has ever bestowed such a derogatory name upon the Turks to this day.

Although most of the white peoples had already left Central Asia by 200 BC, the region would not come under the complete control of Mongoloid peoples, nor would the assimilation of the white nations in the region take place, until the 7th–8th centuries AD, and the white peoples would maintain their presence and influence in the region.

The 'Asian Huns' myth is the first of the lies that have been told to the Turks for over 80 years. For, as we have said, it has been known since 1945 that 'Hunnu' actually refers to the 'Shunnu'. But what is the reason for this insistence on the 'Hunnu' myth? It was to project an image of the Turks as Central Asians and thereby convince both the Turks and other European peoples that 'the mixing of races is normal, because they themselves are already degenerate and mixed-race'. Another aim was to mobilise the Turks against Soviet Russia on behalf of the West and themselves. For this reason, neither the works of Otto Maenchen-Helfen on the 'so-called Asian Huns', nor the works of historians such as Denis Sinor—who states that the Turks first encountered the Chinese around 600 AD—nor the results of genetic tests carried out on this people have ever been disclosed in Turkey. And the lies told and the truths concealed are by no means limited to these.

The Turks had already appeared in European records as early as AD 43. When Pomponius Mela, a Roman geographer

published his *Map of the Known World* in AD 43, he referred to the region north of the Sea of Azov (Azak) as "Turcae". The Latin word "Turcae" is pronounced "Turkaaya". Gaius Plinius Secundus, known in English as Pliny the Elder, also referred to the region as "Tyrcae" in his 37-volume encyclopaedia *Natural History*, a term pronounced similarly to "Türkaay" in Latin,

"Tuirkaay". This 'y' letter does not actually exist in Latin; it was more commonly found in words borrowed from Greek into Latin. The origin of this word was the Greek "Toûrkoi", and it was pronounced approximately as "Tourkiy/Turkoi".

For example, the Turks' appearance in European historical records dates back to the 1st century AD. Roman and Byzantine records identify the Turks' homeland as the area north of the Sea of Azov, the Pripyat region of Ukraine, and the vicinity of the city of Kuban in the North Caucasus.

In other words, contrary to popular belief, the first Turkic state was established not in Asia but in Europe. The first state known in history as a Turkic state was the European Hun Empire (AD 370). The first Turkic state established in Asia, however, was not the Great Hun Empire (200 BC) but the Göktürk State (552 AD), which was founded only 80–100 years after the fall of the European Huns. Today, many Turks believe that the first Turkic state was founded in Central Asia in 200 BC. In fact, it would take another five centuries for a Turkic state to be established in Asia.

Although the European Hun Empire, the first Turkic state, was founded in AD 370, the history of the Turks in Europe stretches back much further, to well before the birth of Jesus. Although it is not possible to give an exact date, the history of the Turks in Europe is so ancient that it led to the region north of the Sea of Azov being named 'Turkey'.

In the early 1st century AD, in the year 43, the Roman geographer Pomponius Mela published his encyclopaedic work *Situ Orbis* (The State of the World). Mela referred to this region north of the Sea of Azov as 'Turcae/Türkae', that is, Turkey. Thirty years after Mela, another Roman, the naturalist Gaius Plinius Secundus, in his work *Naturalis Historia* (Natural History), written in 77 AD, mentions the peoples living in this region and includes the "Tyrcae" – that is, the Turks – amongst them. No specific Turkish tribe is named in these works.

However, as far as can be gathered from the writings of Roman historians, the Turks during this period lived in the area around the Pripyat Marshes on the border between Belarus and Ukraine, as well as in the region between there and Kiev.

The first work to mention a Turkic tribe is *De Origine et Situ Germanorum* (On the Origin and Location of the Germans), written by the Roman historian Tacitus in AD 98. This work mentions the Huns for the first time.

Tacitus identifies this same region and the city of Kuban as the homeland of the Huns, whom he states lived in the North Caucasus. The name 'Huns' also appears in the book *De Situ Orbis Habitabilis* (*On the State of the Inhabited World*), written by the Roman traveller Dionysius Periegetes—who lived in the same century—in which he provides information on various countries and peoples. Periegetes, whilst describing the North Caucasus and its inhabitants, refers to the people living there as 'Huns'. Another Roman who mentions the Turks is Claudius Ptolemy, of Hellenic (Greek) origin. Ptolemy, a naturalist, astronomer and geographer,

mentions the Huns whilst listing the peoples of the Pontic Steppes (present-day Ukraine and southern Russia) in the 2nd century AD.

In subsequent years, the name 'Turk' appears in the work *De Administrando Imperio* (On the Administration of the Empire), written by the Byzantine Emperor Flavius Porphyrogennetos VII between 952 and 959, and generally in connection with the Hungarians (not the Huns). However, the Hungarians were also sometimes referred to as "Huns". In *De Administrando Imperio*, it is stated that the Serbs "lived on the other side of Turkey, in the region of Bohemia, which lies within the borders of the present-day Czech Republic". Here, the phrase "the other side of Turkey" refers to the Kingdom of Hungary. Furthermore, when referring to the church organisation in Hungary, the term "Turkish Metropolis" is used.

In the Emperor's work, it is noted that the Turks, unlike other peoples, had no princes or lords and were governed by voivodes; this is an interesting piece of information regarding Turkish history. This is because this title was later to be widely used by the Slavic peoples.

This work mentions seven Turkic tribes, including the Khazars. It is evident from this information that a Turkic identity and language had by then emerged, and the region where this occurred was the Balkans.

From the accounts of Roman Empire historians, it is understood that the Turks have been in Europe for at least 2,000 years and that there was already a substantial Turkic population living in Europe at that time. Moreover, a Turkic identity (and language) had by then emerged, and the region where it emerged was Eastern Europe. Turkic communities, meanwhile, stretched from the Balkans to the Ukrainian and Russian steppes, and as far as the Ural Mountains. In other words, the Turks' homeland is not Central Asia, but Eastern Europe. The first state known by the name 'Turk' in history was not the Göktürks, but the European

Huns and their successors, the Hungarians. And, of course, we must not forget the Khazars, the last Turkic state in Europe, which we shall also discuss. Indeed, when we look at Turkic history, we see that most Turkic states—from the Huns to the Avars, and from the Oghuz to the Seljuks—were established between the Caucasus and the Balkans.

The Expulsion of the Turks from Europe

The history of the Anatolian Turks does not, as is commonly believed, begin with Turkic tribes arriving from Central Asia. Of course, the advance of the Turks—who were spread across a vast region stretching from the Caucasus to the north of the Sea of Azov—into Western Europe was halted by the Roman forces during the Huns' era and by the Frankish armies during the Avars' era, forcing the Turks to return to the European part of Rus from whence they had come. In these lands, however, there was now a Slavic population that was growing steadily and had largely consolidated its unity. This situation led some of the Turks to seek refuge in the Byzantine Empire, whilst the majority would head for the Caucasus.

The Huns, returning to their ancestral homeland in the Caucasus, and the Turks forced to abandon their homelands around the Sea of Azov, would unite with the Khazar Turks still living in the Caucasus at that time to establish the Khazar State, which would serve as a precursor to both the Seljuk Empire and the Republic of Turkey. Another group of Turks, meanwhile, would establish the Kuman-Kipchak (Kumchak) State north of the Caucasus; indeed, the Asian branch of the Kumchaks marked the foundation of the Khazar State and, in fact, the beginning of the Turks' settlement in Anatolia.

There were also those who came to the Seljuks from Central Asia. This is because, following the collapse of the Khazar State, some of the Khazars moved to Central Asia to establish the Göktürk State, whilst others went to the Balkans to found the Avar Empire. In fact, the Oğuz Yabguluğu, was a principality or province situated in the far east of the Khazar Empire, on the shores of the Caspian Sea. The foundations of the Great Seljuk Empire were laid when Seljuk Bey and his supporters, having lost the power struggle within the Oğuz Yabguluğu, moved to the city of Rey. Although part of this empire's population was made up of those who had come from the Oğuz Yabguluğu (and thus the Khazars) , the Göktürk (Scythian/Saka) and Kuman Turks, who had migrated from Eastern Europe to Central Asia, also joined this empire, thereby adding to the Turkish population of the Seljuk state. In other words, there is no question of Turks coming from Central Asia to Anatolia. For, as we have seen, the origins of those coming from Central Asia were not, in fact, Central Asia itself.

Subsequently, the Great Seljuk Empire was succeeded by the Anatolian Seljuk State, and this in turn by the Ottoman Empire. Viewing Turkish history from this perspective, it is evident that the Turks have possessed a state that has endured uninterrupted for 1,350 years, from 650 to the present day; whilst the borders and form of government of this state may have changed, its ethnic composition has remained unchanged.

The Göktürks

"The Turks belong to the White Alpine Race... It must not be forgotten that the language of the Alpine race was formerly known as the Turanian language, whereas the name of this language is in fact Turkish... Professor Elliot states that the Alpine people (that is, the Turks) spread the Turkish language throughout Europe... Since the language of the Alpine Race is Turkish , and since the Alpine Race—that is, the Turkic Race—has spread throughout the world, it is only natural to find traces of the Turkic language wherever they went and came into contact with local peoples, both in Europe and Asia." (The Turkic Race and the Turkic Language, Journal of Turkish Anthropology, No. 13, 1932)

The origins of the Aşina clan, founders of the Göktürks—the first Turkic state established in Central Asia—or exactly when they arrived in Central Asia are, in fact, unknown. In reality, the theories on this subject amount to nothing more than speculation. However, one thing is certain. Central Asia is not the homeland of the Göktürks. Identifying Central Asia as the origin of the Göktürks (and the Aşina clan) is illogical for several reasons. The primary problem concerns the very definition of 'Aşina' itself and the identity of the Aşinas. This is because, during that period, there were several peoples referred to as 'Aşina' in Chinese records, and they all lived in different regions. According to Chinese historical records, these communities known as the Aşina were scattered across various regions, from eastern Mongolia to the north and west of the ancient Xunhu Empire. In other words, there were many communities living thousands of kilometres apart at the same time, all referred to by the name 'Aşina'. This is because, at that time, the name 'Aşina' was used to denote independent warrior communities. Thus, the Turkic tribe that founded the Göktürks (perhaps by chance, or perhaps because they were nomadic mercenaries) is a Turkic tribe known by this name.

As can be understood from what we have explained, the name 'Aşina' is not the name of a nation or a people. The meaning attributed to the name 'Aşina' today is entirely a conjecture and an unfounded assumption.

Even citing the Aşinas as the founders of the Göktürks could be problematic in itself. This is because the available data suggests that the Turkic-origin Aşinas appeared suddenly. Historians' attempts to link them to a specific ethnic group are, for the reasons explained above, a stretch.

Historians refer to the Aşina clan—the founders of the Göktürks—as the Aşinalı people, a group that fled the Juan Juan. This community, however, was a small clan comprising approximately 500 families. Consequently, it is impossible for them to have founded such a vast empire as the Göktürk Empire. This is because, unlike other Turkic states, the Göktürk state was founded in a region entirely foreign to the Turks in terms of race and culture, and, judging by these figures, by a very small population. It is impossible for a people with such a small population to have founded and governed a state with such vast borders as the Göktürk State. Moreover, the problem is not merely the number and racial characteristics of the Aşina people referred to.

The culture of the Aşinas, who founded the Göktürks, is not Asian either.

To these facts, which have been glossed over, we must also add certain distorted truths; one of these concerns the Turkic runes (tamgas). Turkic runes resemble Germanic and Slavic runes. Those who are curious may compare them. The runes (tamgas) used in the Göktürk inscriptions bear no relation to the writing or alphabet of the Chinese or any other Asian people. The Turkic runes used in the Orkhon inscriptions resemble Slavic, Nordic (Norwegian, Swedish, etc.) and Germanic runes. This indicates that the Göktürks' language was influenced by Nordic or Germanic peoples. Perhaps the opposite was true:

the Germanic and Nordic peoples may have adapted their scripts under the influence of the Turkic script. It is clear that this script emerged simultaneously as a result of living in a shared geographical area and mutual interaction. However, one thing is certain: this script (the Orkhon) does not originate from Central Asia. These scripts are of European origin.

Molybdomancy, that is, the tradition of lead-casting, is a custom found in various European cultures, including Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Germany, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Switzerland, the Czech Republic and Turkey.

The Turks who travelled to Central Asia took with them not only their script but also their myths and legends. The similarities between the Göktürk myths and those of ancient Rome are striking. The legend of the 'she-wolf who suckled the founding ancestors of the Roman Empire'—which is quite well known in the West and which the Turks, including the Hun Emperor Attila, learnt during his campaign against Rome—was also passed down to the Ashina Turks. The two young children who were rescued from the hands of their enemies and would later found the Roman Empire, Remus and Romulus, are nursed by a she-wolf in a similar form to the famous legend of the Ashina clan.

Here, too, a child who escaped from his enemies and would later become the founder of the Ashina clan is nursed by a she-wolf.

The wolf, the totem animal of the Ashina tribe (and indeed of all Turks), is also the totem animal of the Nordic peoples—such as the Swedes, Norwegians and Finns—as well as the Slavs. There are only two peoples who attach as much importance to the wolf as the Turks do: the Germans and the Serbs.

The wolf is so important to the Germans that it features in various state and military symbols. It has even been used as the name for certain military operations and organisations. For example, when Nazi Germany realised it was going to lose the Second World War, it established a guerrilla force to resist the Allied occupation; this organisation the name 'Werewolves', and the guerrillas affiliated with it were also called werewolves and were-women. The German werewolves and were-women continued to resist until 1947, and as a result of these groups' actions, hundreds of occupiers were killed and thousands wounded.

Another people who attach as much importance to the wolf as the Turks are the Serbs. The wolf also holds an important place in Serbian military and state symbols. Moreover, the grey wolf is the totem animal of the Serbs, and in Serbian mythology, the grey wolf is regarded as the ancestor of the Serbian people – just as in the Turks' 'Türeyiş Destanı' (Epic of Creation). Furthermore, when the Serbian and Roman wolf legends are compared with the Aşina legend, it becomes apparent that the Aşina legend is a synthesis of the Serbian and Roman legends. A child suckled by a wolf and a people descended from a wolf.

As can be understood from what we have outlined here, the belief in a totem animal is not unique to the Turks, and is found amongst almost all the peoples of Eastern Europe. Moreover, the wolf is a very special animal not only for the Turks, but also for the Slavs and the Germans. And this was the case hundreds of years before the Göktürks. All this aside, the burial rituals of the Aşina clan are also foreign to the peoples of Central Asia. Research shows that the Turks' burial rituals are identical to those of the Slavs.

The Turks, Slavs and Germans fought for control of Eastern Europe, with the Slavs emerging victorious. It was the attacks by the Russians that brought down the Khazar Empire. The Principality of Kiev launched its final attack on the Khazars in 965; following their defeat, some of the Khazars dispersed and migrated to different regions. However, it is understood that the weakening of the Khazars was also significantly influenced by chieftains and voivodes such as the Göktürks, the Avars and Seljuk Bey, who came into conflict with Khazar authority.

The claim that the Khazars were Jewish was put forward by Ernest Renan, one of the Zionist mentors of Ahmed Ağaoğlu, a Turkish citizen of Azerbaijani origin and a Pan-Turkist. By doing so, Renan was attempting to establish the view that Judaism is a religion, not a race. Yet Judaism is not a religion open to anyone who wishes to join, as it is based on the covenant made with Abraham and his descendants.

So why, then, is Turkish history narrated with a focus on Central Asia? Because the aim is still to send the Turks back to Central Asia. For this reason, such research has either never been carried out in Turkey or has not been published. Appointed by pro-NATO generals, Fulbright-educated, liberal or so-called Atatürkists or nationalists/ummahists—some of whom are Freemasons— some funded by USAID, have continued to perpetuate the 'fairy tale of Central Asia as the Turkish homeland'. Admittedly, Central Asia was the homeland of the entire white race, but this subject has never been raised by these so-called Turkish academics.

THOSE WHO WERE PURGED AND THOSE WHO CARRIED OUT THE PURGES

It is deliberate on the part of Islamists to accuse everyone who contributed to the birth of Turkish nationalism of being Jewish or Freemasons. Jews and Freemasons have supported 'Islamist and ummah-oriented nationalists at heart' and all Islamist organisations. But never the true nationalists! Today, regardless of their degree of radicalism, all Islamist movements have been supported by Jews aiming to eliminate nationalist movements. In the 1950s, it was the Jews who pushed America to support Islamists rather than nationalists against communism. This was because they believed they could not control the secularists and nationalists. We have already noted that Turkish nationalism emerged as a reaction to Arab nationalism. The reason we do not use the term 'Arab nationalism' here is that these movements are backed by the Wahhabi Kingdom of Saudi Arabia; in other words, Arab identity, and indeed Saudi identity, are inextricably intertwined with religion. We touched upon this point above as well.

In conclusion, linking nationalism to Freemasons and the like is the height of deceit and serves the Zionists' aim of destroying nation-states based on "blood ties". Jews, who jealously protect their own race, normalise and encourage interracial sexual relations when other peoples are concerned. Those who are curious may take a look at the American TV series broadcast on Turkish online streaming channels. Islamism is also a tool used by the Zionists to destroy 'nation-states and nations'.

After all, Khomeini was in France until he came to power in Iran following the revolution. America trained Islamist terrorists to fight against the Communist Afghan regime. Cemalettin Kaplan was staging a demonstration in Cologne, Germany, shouting, 'We have come to die, to die, to die; we have come to destroy the Kemalist order'—and he was even holding model Kalashnikovs! From ISIS to the Islamists in Syria, all of them were financed, trained and organised by the Zionists and the United States and Western Europe under their control. When FETÖ died, not even his body was returned; he was buried in the United States. Therefore, if Islamists are so determined to look for Freemasons or Jewish agents, they should first take a look at themselves.

Anyone with even a passing knowledge of Turkish history and who keeps up with current affairs will immediately realise this: 'Turkish Islamists have never carried out a single act targeting America or the Zionists!' For instance, it has always been these Islamists and Turanists who have waged the fiercest struggle against anti-American elements in Turkey. Even today, there has never been any instance of so-called Islamist groups attacking American targets. The fact that, whilst Israel was striking Gaza, attacks were directed at Russia—a supporter of Palestine—rather than at America, a supporter of Israel, is the result of this covert collaboration. But let's not deny the facts. The Zionists have been supporting the Islamists for years through the Americans. As the saying goes, "A dog does not bite the hand that feeds it."

It is also interesting to note the long-standing, coordinated collaboration—including in America—between the Jews who kill Arabs in Palestine and Saudi Arabia, an Arab state. This triad is working together to 'Arabise' non-Arab peoples and to ensure that the Arab understanding of Islam becomes dominant in other societies. In Turkey, too, almost all religious communities and orders have been funded, either directly or through Arab intermediaries, under US-Zionist guidance. FETÖ is the best-known of these groups. Even the Turkish State's official religious officials have been funded with the tacit approval of the so-called patriotic Turkish generals of the 12 September coup. For those wishing to learn more on this subject, we recommend reading Uğur Mumcu's book *Rabıta*.

The Jews, who were responsible for the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the complete loss of the Balkans during that process, are still working towards the same aim today. To this end, they have bought off all sections of Turkish society. Their agents within every ideology are working towards the same goal; only the rhetoric and methods vary.

Some argue that the nation-state is finished in the name of liberalism, some in the name of Islam, and others in the name of European socialism.

As for the faction operating under the guise of Kemalism or nationalism, they are either intent on making Kurds and Afghans say 'I am Turkish' to make them happy, or they are inventing Turks from Central Asia all the way to America. You may, for various reasons, be an Islamist or a nationalist (a 'light' ummah-ist), and you may. But there can be no state or nation based on religion. One must recognise that Sunnis, Shi'ites and Alevis—and that Shi'ites do not like Sunnis or Alevis, nor do Wahhabis like any of them, and that there are deep sectarian differences between them—will end up slaughtering one another. Moreover, even Islamism has its own different shades. Salafis, the Taliban and so on—even within their own ranks, numerous factions are divided and will take up arms in the name of their own interpretation; indeed, they already have. Consider, too, the collapse of nation-states. Even the Arabs, whom we tend to view as a single entity, possess distinct cultures, histories and interpretations of Islam. The Saudis, with their approximately 250-year-old state tradition, possess a very different culture and worldview, whilst Syria and Iraq, with their Ba'athist past, are quite distinct. Indeed, even Syria (due to its geographical and ethnic makeup) is very different from Iraq.

Algeria and Tunisia, both countries in the Western Mediterranean, bear no resemblance to any of the others. Even Libya, situated between Algeria and Egypt, is very different from its neighbours. This is because there is no single Islam. Everyone interprets Islam according to their own understanding, however it may seem to you. Even if there were no differences in sect, country, lineage, history or geography – even if they were all children of the same country – as we see even among the Sufi orders in Anatolia, they would still be unable to agree with one another. Because, even if nothing else, they interpret the words of their own religious leaders differently. The ideology of Islamism (which is not even an ideology) brings nothing but destruction. A country founded on religious ideas can only end up, if it is lucky, like Libya; if not, like Afghanistan. This is precisely what the Jews want. For the Jews, getting Muslims to kill one another is an easier solution than trying to kill them themselves. Therefore, before accusing Turkish nationalists of Freemasonry, one must first know who it is that is putting forward these allegations.

As for those posing as nationalists (the Turanists), they are all working for America. Even as the US is establishing a Kurdistan right on our doorstep today, instead of bellowing about 'who-knows-what in Crimea' and hurling abuse at Russia, they ought to be praying for a Russian victory. Because Turkey is on America's list of countries to reshape one by one. Unless one is blind or an imbecile, it is impossible not to see that once Syria, Iraq and Libya have fallen, and Russia and Iran are also destroyed, Turkey will be next in line. To turn a blind eye to this, one need only be a traitor. Russia's situation is different. For the path to absolute Jewish domination to be cleared, Russia—Europe's strongest power and one of the world's major powers—must be destroyed. The country that must be destroyed for Israel's security, however, is Turkey. Turkey's fate, in turn, depends on its neighbouring countries.

But Turkey has, up to now, dug its own grave by supporting the operations carried out against these countries. Our grave is now as good as ready; we simply do not know when we will be buried. For it is so obvious that Israel does not want a major power in the region that it would be a grave mistake to believe Turkey will be spared. In fact, the Jews' plans regarding Turkey had already become apparent as early as the 1990s with the 'Operation Hammer' operations. Prior to that, following the collapse of the Soviet Union, articles appeared in newspapers – including in Turkey – stating that the Kemalist Republic was next in line. Western think tanks published reports on this subject.

Again in the 1990s, American helicopters supplying weapons and equipment to the PKK at the time made headlines, but no one – not even the military of the era – raised a voice. Even when the Americans openly struck the Muavenet destroyer, the military, politicians, media figures, academics, Islamists and nationalists all chose to turn a blind eye. The only person who did speak out, in yet another tragic twist, died when his plane crashed. This person was the Commander-in-Chief of the Gendarmerie. Despite this, no one in Turkey spoke out. All political assassinations were covered up. The only difference between pre-AKP Turkey and post-AKP Turkey is that the AKP is openly pro-American. Let us be clear: after Atatürk, Turkey was only able to govern itself for two terms. One of these was the term of Bülent Ecevit, the other that of Necmettin Erbakan. They were not left in peace either; they were overthrown one way or another.

Those who dismantled Turkish nationalism yesterday are now exploiting the vacuum created by that dismantling to set about the dismantling of Turkish identity itself, and are preparing to deliver the final blow. Despite everything, Turkey can still be saved. Only a 'National Revolution' can save Turkey. The Republic must return to the 1930s—socially, culturally and ideologically—and indeed, we must go even further. For the demographic structure has been disrupted. Turkey is under occupation by millions of foreigners from Asia, Africa and the Middle East. Had the Greeks won in 1923, would their aim not have been to bring a Greek population to Anatolia? Wouldn't they have run our factories and mines? This is precisely where we find ourselves today. What difference is there between an occupier coming from Greece and one coming from Afghanistan? Setting this occupation aside, those who have grown rich at the expense of the Turkish people have begun relocating their factories abroad, driven by a greed for more money.

We must abolish the free-market economy, as the fascists or National Socialists would have done; we must regulate the economy, determine investments, introduce price controls, and punish arbitrary price hikes with the harshest penalties. We must not forget that one of Atatürk's principles was 'Revolutionary Spirit'. We must adopt a more state-centred approach to industrial investment; many industrial investments and mining activities should be carried out by Turks in partnership with the state, whilst all factories and mines owned or operated by foreigners must be nationalised. Turkish industrialists must not be permitted to close their factories in Turkey; in cases of wilful neglect or lack of maintenance, we must seize all the assets of these businessmen. This can only be achieved with the support of Russia and China, as Turkey has no chance of standing up to a country like the United States on its own.

THE DEVIL IS IN THE DETAILS

To understand why the Zionists want to mix the Turks with Central Asian, Middle Eastern, African and other races, you need to study Jewish theology. Of course, it's not just the Turks who are targeted, but all white people. Of course, those fair-haired but Mongolian Turks who identify with Central Asians might not be too bothered by this. Neither would those with secret gay tendencies or fantasies of sharing their wife or girlfriend with Black people, Arabs and so on. It's also hardly possible to understand the ideological underpinnings of the Turanists. One wonders what lies beneath their ideological framework. Turks don't actually speak Turkish, mind you, but let's assume for a moment that they do. The situation of a man who accepts anyone who speaks Turkish as a Turk, regardless of their race, is similar to that of a man who says: 'Let my wife cheat on me if she wants to. It's not my bloodline, but as long as my surname continues, that's enough.' Yet what matters is not the continuation of the language or the surname, but the continuation of the bloodline. This is natural for both parents and nations. Anything else is coercion.

Jewish producers portray sexual relationships between white people and other races in American TV series, thereby normalising the situation. The adverts by Jewish-Masonic advertisers are equally peculiar.

Returning to Turkey. Years ago, in an advert for 'Falım chewing gum'. A blonde Turkish girl was paired with a pure-blooded Kurd; he was presented as the 'Prince on a White Horse'. I wonder whether the owner of the advertising agency was Jewish or a Freemason? Even if he harboured no animosity towards Kurds, it was not normal for a man of Turkish descent to pair a Turkish girl with a Kurdish man. This is not something that would occur to a normal person. Imagine yourself as an advertiser. Why would you pair a Turkish girl with a Kurdish man, let alone a rural Kurdish man with an urban Kurdish girl? What difference would it make if she were urban? Is the value Kurds place on women the same as that placed by Turks? Especially back then. 30–35 years ago. If Kurds have started to value women today, it's thanks to the Turks. And they're still far behind in this respect. That's why, even if you don't focus on race, it's culturally impossible. Especially back then. At the very least, culturally it wouldn't happen; it wouldn't even cross a person's mind. They'd find it odd and wouldn't do it. Unless, of course, they had a hidden agenda or a twisted ideology. You might well ask, 'Why shouldn't a Turkish girl and a Kurdish lad fall in love?' Well, in that case, I'd expect you not to watch or criticise the love between Turks and Kurds (men/lads) either. To be honest, relationships between gay men are more normal than couples formed between men and women of different races. At least they aren't having children and corrupting the nation's bloodline.

One final question: why would a rabbi buy a website like Pornhub?

TURKISH, SLAVIC, GERMAN, HUNGARIAN AND VIKING

COMPARISONS OF ALPHABETS/RUNES

[images not available]

TURKISH

SLAVIC

GERMAN

HUN-TURKISH/HUNGARIAN

TURKISH and VIKING

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Against the Current: Essays in the History of Ideas, Isaiah Berlin; Hogarth Press, 1979 The European Triarchy, Moses Hess; Otto Wigad, Leipzig 1841

International Encyclopedia of the First World War

Behind the Balfour Declaration – Britain's Great War Pledge to the Rothschild Bankers, by Robert John; Institute for Historical Review (1970)

Why Did We Enter the First World War?, Kazım Karabekir, Volumes 1 and 2, Emre Publications, 5th edition, Istanbul-2000 Dr Faruk Özerengin (ed.)

Minutes of the Chamber of Deputies, Session: III, Vol. 2, Year: 4, pp. 424, 426; Cemal Pasha, Memoirs (1913–1922), Nehir Publications, Istanbul–2006

The Huns and the Hsiung-Nu, Otto Mänchen-Helfen, *Byzantion*, vol. 17, (1944–45a)

'The Legend of the Origin of the Huns', Otto Mänchen-Helfen; *Byzantion*, vol. 17, (1944–45b)

'The Yueh-chih Problem Re-examined.' Otto Mänchen-Helfen, Journal of the American Oriental Society, vol. 65, (1945)

'Manichaeans in Siberia.' *Semitic and Oriental Studies Presented to William Popper*, ed. by Walter J. Fischel; *University of California Publications in Semitic Philology*, vol. 9. Berkeley: University of California Press (1951)

The World of the Huns: Studies in Their History and Culture, ed. by Max Knight; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (1973)

Proceedings of the First Turkish History Congress, A. İnan, 1932:22–23

Russian Freemasons at the Beginning of the 20th Century. Sh. Marjani Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, Kazan, Russian Federation, MAJKOPSKOGO GOSUDARSTVENNOGO TEHNOLOGICESCOGO UNIVERSITEYA 2023.15/3 – ISSN 2078-1024 VESTNIK

Russian Freemasonry. 1731–2000. Encyclopaedic Dictionary, A. I. Serkov

History of Russian Freemasonry in the 19th Century, A. I. Serkov; Published by Revue des études slaves; Vol. 74, No. 4, Le Sentimentalisme Russe (2002–2003)

The Masonic Intelligentsia in Russia in the Late 19th — Early 20th Centuries, Dr S. P. Karpachev, Moscow State University (1998)

Russian Masons and the Revolution, B. I. Nikolaevsky; Chalidze Publications (1990)

https://statehistory.ru/books/BrachevV-S---SHubin-A-V-_Masony-i-Fevralskaya-revolyutsiya-1917-goda/3

https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/s-n-maksudi-i-rossiyskie-masony-v-nachale-hh-vhttps://www.astree.org/forum/index.php?/topic/195-shakhmatnyi-pol-zodcheskaia-rabota-brata-ps/

Theodor Herzl: The Charismatic Leader (Jewish Lives); Jonathan Penslar, Published by Yale University Press (2020)

Rabıta, Uğur Mumcu; Tekin Publishing House (1993)

Life and Adventures of Vámbéry; Mary E. Woolley; The University Library of Autobiography XV. F. Tyler Daniels Company

The Yuechi Problem: A Re-examination; Journal of the American Oriental Society (1945) The Huns and the Hunnu, Otto John Maenchen-Helfen, Byza Publications (1944)

The Interaction between Nationalism and Populism in Nurettin Topçu's Political Thought, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Bursa: Uludağ University Institute of Social Sciences; Süleyman Seyfi Öğün (1991)

A General Overview of the History of the Turkish Race and Civilisation, Reşit Galip, 1932: 157–161
The Origin of the Turks, Osman Karatay, Kripto Publications (2011)

The Races of Europe, by Stevens Coon Carleton, The Macmillan Company (1939)

The Hidden History of Zionism, by Annie Levin; International Socialist Review Issue 24, July–August 2002

Political Parties in Turkey, Tarık Zafer Tunaya, Committee of Union and Progress, vol. 3, İletişim Publications, Istanbul-2000, pp. 569–572.

Enver Pasha, Vol. 3, by Şevket Süreyya Aydemir, Remzi Kitabevi, 2nd edition, Istanbul-1978, pp. 368, 395;

General Staff Headquarters, History of the Turkish Armed Forces: Ottoman Period – First World War – Administrative Activities and Logistics, vol. X, General Staff Printing House, Ankara-1985, p. 194;

History of the Turkish Parliament: The First and Second Constitutional Periods, Vol. 1, Grand National Assembly of Turkey Foundation Publications, Ankara, 1997, pp. 661–662

The Anthropological Characteristics of the Turkish People and Turkish History: Anatolia, the Homeland of the Turkish Race, Afet İnan; Ankara, Turkish Historical Society, 1947

The Price of Money – Interest Rates in Medieval Sources: Examples from Tyrol 1287–1406, Stephan Nicolussi-Köhler – Postdoctoral Researcher at the University of Mannheim, Department of History

Jewish Encyclopedia https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/4906-darmesteter-james

Chabad Org

https://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/2613870/jewish/Jewish-Soul-in-a-Non-Jewish-Body.htm

Renan's Life of Jesus. Translated, with an introduction, by William G. Hutchison; London: Walter Scott, Ltd., Paternoster Square (1897)

Ibn al-Athir, al-Kamil, Vol. V, p. 52.

An Encyclopedia of Cultural Sociology of the Middle East, Asia, and Africa, Andrea Stanton. US: Sage Publications. pp. 12–13 (2012).

Merriam-Webster's Encyclopedia of World Religions. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster. p. 186

The Wayback Machine – A Greek-English Lexicon, Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, on Perseus, 8 April 2021

BERSERKER
BOOKS